SEMINAR ON INDIAN ART HISTORY

1962

पु
क्र 3934
प्रा
State Museum, Library

Convenor and Editor
Dr. MOTI CHANDRA

700
C S.62

ललित कला

LALIT KALĀ AKADEMI
NEW DELHI

STATE MUSEUM, LUCKNOW
LIBRARY
Acc. No. 3934
Book No. 700
C S.62

SEMINAR ON INDIAN ART HISTORY

1962

3934
26.8.70
State Museum, Library

Convenor and Editor
Dr. MOTI CHANDRA

ललित कला

LALIT KALĀ AKADEMI
NEW DELHI

700
C S.62

Rs. 5/-

Published by B. C. Sanyal, Secretary, for Lalit Kala Akademi, Rabindra Bhavan, New Delhi 1, and
printed by Isaac N. Isaac at Vakil & Sons Private Ltd., 18 Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.

CONTENTS

Pages

Introduction 1-8

Proceedings 9-72

Appendix A 73-83

Some Problems of Art and Iconography during the age of the Kushāṇas and the Sātavāhanas by J. N. Banerjea

Appendix B 84-104

Extensions of Gupta Art:

Art and Architecture of the Pratīhāra Age by Krishna Deva

State Museum, Library, Lko.

SEMINAR ON
INDIAN ART HISTORY — 1962

Participants

1. V. S. Agrawala
2. Mulk Raj Anand
3. K. D. Bajpai
4. J. N. Banerjea
5. A. K. Bhattacharyya
6. Moti Chandra, *Convenor*
7. Pramod Chandra
8. M. N. Deshpande
9. Krishna Deva
10. K. K. Ganguli
11. A. Ghosh
12. D. P. Ghosh
13. Anand Krishna, *Local Secretary*
14. Rai Krishna Das
15. Nihar Ranjan Ray
16. S. K. Sarasvati
17. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri

Observers

1. Ingrid Aal
2. S. N. Chowdhary
3. A. K. Dutta
4. P. M. Joshi
5. S. C. Kala
6. Grace Morley
7. A. K. Narain
8. Vidya Prakash
9. D. N. Sinha
10. J. N. Tiwari
11. L. K. Tripathi
12. Sheila Weiner

INTRODUCTION

IN accordance with a resolution of the General Council, dated May 9, 1961, the Lalit Kalā Akademi convened a seminar on the problems of Indian art history March 11-13, 1962, at the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, Banaras.

Eighteen art historians from all over the country were requested to read papers, and another twelve scholars were asked to participate in the discussions as observers. Topics under consideration were: "Problems of Kushāṇa and Sātavāhana Art" (March 11); "Extensions of Gupta Art" (March 12); and "Pre-Mughal Painting of the Sultanate Period" (March 12).

In addition, one lecture was presented each evening, to which the general public was invited.

The Convenor of the seminar was Dr. Moti Chandra. He was assisted in the local arrangements for housing and accommodation by Dr. Anand Krishna as Local Secretary.

The Convenor Dr. Moti Chandra, at the opening session of the seminar, welcomed the participants and pointed out that this was the first gathering ever to be held in India of art historians. Though the time was short, the seminar had received enthusiastic support. He hoped that in coming years the seminar would take even bigger shape and many more problems touched upon.

The Chairman of the Akademi, Sri Mehdi Nawaz Jung, declared the seminar open. He remarked upon the appropriateness of the first seminar being held at Banaras, which had for centuries maintained its pre-eminent position as a cultural and an educational centre in India. He called attention to the hopes slowly being realized by lovers of art in

India of establishing a true "Parliament of Artists", and the place of the State akademies in fulfilling this objective. The Akademi had a programme (funds permitting) to take up the cause of art, and other seminars of this type should be helpful in the fulfilment of this objective.

Prof. J. N. Banerjea was moderator of the first day's sessions on "Problems of Kushāṇa and Sātavāhana Art". The session began with a short paper by Sri A. Ghosh on the methodology of art history and the extent to which dynastic names could be attached to art styles. (A detailed report of the discussion which took place is given in the proceedings.)

More than 100 scholars, university students and local citizens attended the first of the three public lectures of Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray on the evening of March 11. His topic was "The Art of the Krishna-Godavari Valley," and the lecture was illustrated with a large number of slides. Dr. V. S. Agrawala was in the chair.

Dr. Ray began by noting that from about the middle of the first century of the Christian era, the "Golden Period" of Indian culture was literally golden, and it was Roman gold which poured into India in exchange for muslin, spices and precious stones that made this possible. If Gujarat was the gateway of gold in the west, the Krishna-Godavari delta was the gateway in the east. This large scale influx of gold saw the growth of luxurious living and establishment of Buddhist *stūpas* and monasteries. Otherwise it would be hard to explain the vigorous activity of the monasteries, which, it is significant to note, declined with the curtailment and final disappearance of the Roman trade.

It was a period of great changes. The quickening of the life process in particular in ancient India, Dr. Ray said, was due to long periods of social and economic changes. The artists were the first to reflect evidences of these changes. It was significant that while written documents and epigraphs fail to record the processes of these changes, they were recorded by the artists. The period under discussion was doubtless a period of storm and stress and social changes, yet one which the contemporary artists understood.

From the donative records, it is possible to get a picture of the social life of the times, which was complex in the Krishna-Godavari's region in the first three or four centuries of the Christian era. The more numerous the economic classes, the more complex became the social fabric.

Discussing the slim, elongated physical type at Jaggayapetta, Dr. Ray suggested that it was a human type taken from life. To support his theory he had taken proportional measurements of 100 sculptures of the region and compared the data with the anthropometrical data of the Chenchu tribe collected by Heimendorf, and to his amazement he found that there did exist a correlation between the sculptural and anthropological data.

When there is a quickening of the life process, the degree of expression may not be uniform, Dr. Ray pointed out. For example, Mathura was also a great centre of trade and commerce and as a consequence it developed a kind of bourgeois society. But if one compared the Yakshi figures from Mathura with similar figures from Amaravati and Nagarjunakonda, one found a real difference. The social complex at Amaravati and the social complex at Mathura could not have been the same. Art explains social-economic complex; the social-economic complex explains the art.

Discussing the use of dynastic names, with which he did not agree, Dr. Ray noted that out of a large number of inscriptions from Nagarjunakonda only some mention members of royal families making donation; not a single king was recorded to have made a donation. Often it was found that while the kings were performing *aśvamedha* sacrifices, the royal ladies were Buddhists, and in keeping with the tolerant spirit of the period the two traditions ran in the same family.

With the use of slides, Dr. Ray pointed out many foreign elements in the art of Amaravati and Nagarjunakonda, and the changes in the use of perspective and organization of sculptural planes.

Dr. V. S. Agrawala acted as moderator for the second day's session of the seminar, which was devoted to a discussion of the "Extensions of Gupta Art," in which Dr. Moti Chandra, Dr. S. K. Sarasvati, Sri Krishna Deva and others participated.

The second day's discussion also resulted in an important proposal which the seminar participants decided to recommend to the Lalit Kalā Akademi.

The participants felt that in order to facilitate research work on various problems of Indian art, the Akademi should publish a set of volumes extensively illustrated. Dr. Agrawala therefore proposed that the Akademi should consider bringing out a series of Indian art albums, in 10 volumes, each with about 1000 illustrations on 500 plates. Volumes 1 and 2 would bring together documentation on Early and Later Sculpture, while the succeeding volumes would be devoted to the Indian Terracottas, Bronzes, Painting, Architecture and Minor Arts. A total expenditure of twelve lakhs extending over a period of five years was anticipated.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray supported the proposal and suggested that a committee might be appointed to go into the details of the scheme and present a plan of action to the Akademi. Accordingly Dr. Agrawala suggested the names of Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, Dr. Moti Chandra, Dr. Mulk Raj Anand, Rai Krishnadasa, and Sri Pramod Chandra (Secretary).

Shri A. Ghosh, Director General of Archaeology in India, offered the co-operation of the Archaeological Survey of India, who would be prepared to supply as many photos as possible for the survey, free of cost, on certain terms and conditions to be decided in mutual consultation with the Lalit Kalā Akademi and the Archaeological Survey of India. With reference to any possible duplication of work on the temple volumes by the Akademi and by the ASI, Sri Ghosh assured there would be no duplication as the ASI scheme was of a different nature and quite specialized.

Sri Ghosh's offer was welcomed by the participants in the seminar.

The Chairman of the Akademi expressed himself in favour of the proposal, suggesting that the survey volumes should have sufficiently complete introductions as to make the volumes useful to the genuinely interested students as well as to the scholars.

Prof. Nilakanta Sastri was in the chair for the second public lecture on Gupta Art by Dr. V. S. Agrawala.

The Gupta age, said Dr. Agrawala, was an age when the culture of the people was as resplendent as gold. Figuratively it is the mind which is gold in man, and at this age the Indian mind was at its best. For several centuries there was a flow of gold into the country, not only the Roman gold, but also the gold from the eastern islands. By the 4th century the yellow metal was so plentiful that poets began to speak of the "rain of gold" which benefited the rich and poor alike. The people welcomed this affluence as divine grace. The wealth and a new vision gave a new turn to art which became a vehicle of higher thoughts, and the Gupta age became an expression of beauty—*rūpasatra*. The aim of the artists was that the beauty in heaven should be brought down to the level of the earth. It was in the fitness of things that Lakshmī, the celebrated goddess of beauty and abundance, became the symbol of the age.

Reflecting the spirit of the times, the art tradition of the Gupta permeated the remotest corners of India. Clay became a common medium of artistic expression and the terracottas from Rang Mahal, Devnimori, Malwa and even as far as Sindh express in no uncertain terms the keen aesthetic spirit of the age.

What is the nature of Gupta sculpture? One might say, Dr. Agrawala explained, that the aim of the sculptor with the chisel and hammer was to carve out the perfection of beauty. His goal was to make beauty manifest by a certain technical process.

During this period the country had come into contact with Persia, China and other countries. It was a period when India was assimilating foreign ideas and at the same time exporting her own forms.

Dr. Agrawala concluded his lecture with an appeal to study Gupta art in all its phases.

On the morning of the third day, March 13, the seminar participants visited the site of the Raj Ghat excavations conducted by the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, Banaras Hindu University and from there proceeded to Sarnath, where the Archaeological Survey of India were their hosts.

The seminar meetings on the 13th were devoted to "Pre-Mughal Painting of the Sultanate Period." Dr. Moti Chandra, who was the moderator for the third session, began by giving a general introduction to this new subject. Sri A. K. Bhattacharyya, Dr. Anand Krishna and Sri Pramod Chandra spoke on the subject focussing attention on new material. Their talks were illustrated with slides.

After lunch Dr. K. K. Ganguli placed before the seminar the following resolution: "Recommended that the Council of the Lalit Kalā Akademi be requested to place before the University Grants Commission, proposals to institute studies in History of Art in Indian universities. At the outset courses may be instituted at the postgraduate level for M.A. degree, to be followed up by undergraduate courses with Pass and Honours degree at the B.A. level."

The resolution which was seconded by Dr. Anand Krishna was passed unanimously.

In the evening the series of public lectures was concluded by Sri Pramod Chandra, who spoke on "Pre-Mughal Painting." Dr. V. S. Agrawala was in the chair.

In his lecture Sri Pramod Chandra endeavoured to indicate the situation of Indian painting in the centuries preceding the foundation of the Mughal school in India. He showed how formerly it was believed that previous to the Mughal school, only Western Indian painting flourished. Recently much new material had come to light which has led us to change our opinion. Sri Chandra struck a note of warning that whatever he had said at this stage must be considered tentative, as new material might change entirely the theories already propounded. He was, however, of the view that at least by the beginning of the 16th century there existed a school of painting which showed a synthesis of Western Indian and Persian styles.

PROCEEDINGS ON THE FIRST DAY

The first day's morning session opened with the reading of the following paper entitled "Some Observations on Dynastic Appellations" by Sri A. Ghosh, Director General of Archaeology in India.

"May I, at the outset, be allowed to congratulate the authorities of the Lalit Kalā Akademi on the organization of this seminar and to express my hope, which, I am sure, is shared by all others present here, that this will be the first of a series of future seminars of its kind?

Next, I must thank the organizers for having invited me to attend it and for permitting me to make a few observations, which, though of a general nature, may not be found to be without import to the subject to be discussed here.

I note that all the three subjects of the seminar have been given dynastic appellations, as if art must go hand in hand with royal conquests. I would wonder if art should not reflect something less ephemeral and should not be treated as something more deep rooted in the soil and its environments than dynastic vagaries.

The emphasis that is placed on political factors in art is sometimes carried to the extreme. We are asked to believe that even minor dynasties had their own art: thus, we come across such labels as Śālayaṅkāyana art, Nolamba art, etc. Such tendencies, I am afraid, preclude a genuine appraisal of art developments and provide a false background to art.

For example, I have heard it said (luckily, not read it in print) that the temple-architecture of Orissa developed under the influence of the southern regions after the conquest of that land by Anatavarman Choḍagaṅga from Āndhra-deśa early in the twelfth century. But the fact is that architecture had started in Orissa at least four centuries earlier and proceeded to develop its individualistic traits till it reached its culmination in what may be called the Kaliṅga Order. There is nothing in it which calls for an explanation on the basis of an extraneous political influence.

Such general considerations apart, there are, to my mind, serious difficulties involved in the first two subjects to be discussed here, viz., Sātavāhana and Kushāṇa art and Gupta art. I shall not say anything about the third, viz., pre-Mughal art, as I know next to nothing about it.

The pre-requisites of the two subjects, conditioned by the names of the dynasties to which they are affiliated, are (i) a certainty on the dates of the respective dynasties and the extent of their kingdoms, and (ii) whether the dynasties had any individualistic art of their own, which they carried with them to whatever region they conquered.

To deal with Sātavāhana art, we must be sure about the Sātavāhanas themselves. Have historians, on whom we must necessarily depend in these respects, agreed among themselves about the date and region of their origin and the extent of their kingdom throughout the period of their existence? Have not the beginning of the Sātavāhanas been dated to the third, second or first century B.C. by different historians? Do the historians not dispute about their provenance—whether it was the northern Deccan or Āndhra-deśa? If, as some hold, not without plausibility, Āndhra-deśa was attached to the Sātavāhana kingdom only by the later rulers of the dynasty, would it be proper to include the early phase of Amaravati within Sātavāhana art? Again, if the dynasty came into being in the first century B.C., shall we discuss under it the Bhaja and Pitalkhora art? If not, what name should be given to it? Will the reliefs on the gateways of Stūpa 1 of Sanchi, one of them known to have been executed in the rule of a Sātavāhana ruler called Śatakarṇī, be regarded as a product of the art of the Sātavāhanas, simply on the ground that they held sway over the region for a short while? Or would it be more appropriate to regard them as an indigenous development of the art of Stūpa 2 of Sanchi itself and of the not-very-far-off Bharhut, both ascribed to a century earlier and the latter known to belong to the rule of the Śuṅgas? In other words, is the art of the Sanchi gateways Sātavāhana or an 'extension' of Śuṅga? Shall we think in terms of the intrusion of Kshatrapa art in central India, following the trail of the Kshatrapa invasion in that region? (Incidentally, we have recently heard of a 'Kshatrapa head' from Gujarat!) In view of all these and other difficulties, what shall we discuss under Sātavāhana art?

Kushāṇa art seems to be an equally risky appellation. Is any homogeneous discussion possible if we include under it two entirely different art-traditions, viz., Gandhāra and Mathura? Yet, both flourished during the rule of the Kushāṇas. Further, we know that sculptures manufactured at Mathura during the Kushāṇa age were exported to distant places, such as Sārnāth, Śrāvastī and Kauśāmbi by enthusiasts like the monk Bala and his disciple the nun Buddhamitrā, and to Ahichchhatrā by the monk Viraṇa. These Mathura specimens did not certainly supersede the products of the local *ateliers*, following indigenous lines of development. There could thus hardly have been one unified Kushāṇa art. And these considerations are irrespective of the disputes on the dates of Kushāṇas themselves, which make art history of the period all the more difficult.

Speaking of the Guptas, it may be observed that while the date of their beginning is certain, their spheres of direct and indirect influences are almost equally uncertain. Unless the latter are pinpointed, it may be difficult to deal with the 'extensions of Gupta art'—both geographical and chronological. There have been discussions on whether the mural art of Ajanta is Gupta in affiliation: Facts of dynastic alliances through matrimony have been brought in to justify this for did not Chandragupta II marry his daughter to a prince of the main Vākāṭaka dynasty of the Deccan? But, if matrimony could influence art, why has nobody traced a Kadamba affiliation of Gupta art in spite of the fact that the Kadamba ruler Kāku(t*)sthavarman married his daughters to the Guptas?

It may be argued that the dynastic appellations are more convenient stylistic labels to denote certain classes of art-products. Even then, the inherent difficulties of dynastic grouping that I have pointed out will remain. Perhaps, a more logical, if arduous, way would be to isolate the elements of individual dated art-products and thereafter examine the spatial and temporal spread of those elements. The groups that will emerge after this examination may then be named after the region and period of their currency. In such stylistic grouping, the groups should be given stylistic and not dynastic labels. Thus will pitfalls of dynastic grouping be averted and early-Indian art-history be placed on a sound footing?

I have placed before you my genuine apprehensions, not without the hope that the forthcoming discussions will dispel them. It may be that I am obsessed by the archaeological method of culture-classification. It may equally be that I am *chāpalāya prachoditaḥ* ('driven to frivolity') for art-criticism is not my subject, though its conclusions must necessarily interest me."

Following the paper discussion took place.

Dr. V. S. Agrawala observed: "The first problem in the study of art history is one of collection of material. The second problem is that of chronology, followed by the problem of borrowing. I make special appeal in the name of the aesthetic creations themselves and suggest that questions of a partisan nature should, as far as possible, be kept aside and efforts should be made to understand the meaning of the art itself. The main function of art is to provide aesthetic joy, and the problems of chronology, important though they are, have disrupted our attention from this function. The main problem relating to Kushāṇa and Sātavāhana art and also Gupta art is the quest of purpose that created these styles, and the cultural background which sought to create works of art. For example, we have the problem of the origin of the Buddha image. There is a great deal of controversy about where the first image of the Buddha was produced, without taking into consideration such elements as *ushṇīsha*, *padmāsana* etc., which form important Indian elements. If the Buddha image was not made up to a certain stage, there must have been certain reasons. For this we should go further into religious history. For example, the *simhāsana* is already known in the lion *dharmachakra* at Sarnath, where the lion represents the Buddha himself and symbolically the lion column at Sarnath is the prototype of the Buddha image.

For the sake of convenience Indian art history resolves itself into an arrangement of schools and periods, at times with dynastic appellations, but the growth of art involves the study of the great religious and philosophical thoughts that inspired these particular schools of art. It is only after a study of the *purpose* that we can arrive at an understanding of the *meaning* of art.

These are more important questions than "chronology" or "borrowing". Exchange of ideas has been going on for centuries and there is no stigma attached to it. For instance, we have been borrowing wheat from America, but the digestion no doubt is our own."

Dr. A. K. Narain disagreed with Dr. Agrawala. In his opinion though meaning is perhaps more important, art would be unintelligible without the framework of chronology. The real problem posed by Dr. Agrawala, according to Dr. Narain, was whether we should dispense with the dynasties. That in his opinion was hardly right.

Dr. Mulk Raj Anand appealed to the archaeologists and the art historians for some kind of bridge between archaeology, scholarship, and art appreciation.

Dr. Moti Chandra did not see why dynastic appellations smacked of partisanship or lacked historical sense. He did not see how chronology helped to understand art concepts. "Does the exact date of Kanishka really lead to an understanding of the fundamental concepts of Kushāṇa art? Chronology has to be there, some kind of framework has to be created, but when the framework becomes the real thing, then we have to object. Whatever nomenclature we adopt in the future, let us be sure it carries some of the glories associated with the period (as for example, 'Gupta')."

Sri Pramod Chandra felt that there was a tendency to treat problems of art as merely adjuncts of the problems of history. "We must also pay due respect to the objects themselves. Art has two aspects—(1) the technical aspect; and (2) its meaning. It is the business of the historian to study history; the business of the art-historian to study art-history which involves the close study of art objects themselves."

Dr. K. K. Ganguli suggested that Coomaraswamy had given us a clue as to how history of art could be written. The art historians have formulated their own technique of study and in this it is the object that matters.

Sri M. N. Deshpande felt that Sri A. Ghosh's point on 'stylistic observation' had been completely neglected, though Dr. Moti Chandra had brought it out. There is no controversy between the methods of archaeology and of art history. For the study of both a commonsense approach is required.

Dr. J. N. Banerjea referred to the futility of such discussion. Art could not be confined to narrow geographical boundaries or dynastic rule. It is simply for convenience's sake that we use the name of the rulers. No sanctity should be given to the name.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray observed: "Dynastic appellations are used merely for convenience; it is a direction of the mind. Art has its own laws which are unfettered by the narrow concepts of dynastic glories. Form moves on according to its own inner direction. We have to find out that inner direction —social, economical, political, ideological—before the true purpose of art in any period could be properly understood."

Sri A. Ghosh, in answer, thanked Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray and Sri M. N. Deshpande for clarifying his point of view. He had been somewhat misunderstood that he was trying to tack art onto archaeology. His criticism of the use of dynastic names was that it encourages narrow provincialism and tends to reflect modern political trends.

The interesting discussion on the observations of Sri Ghosh was followed by the paper of Sri M. N. Deshpande entitled "A Plea for a Deccan School of Sātavāhana Sculpture." He observed:

"The recent discovery of a large number of sculptures at Pitalkhora has opened a new page in the history of art of the Deccan. A fresh study of Sātavāhana sculpture in the light of this new material has revealed certain developmental characteristics hitherto unnoticed or partially noticed. In this paper an attempt is made to trace the development of the Sātavāhana school of sculpture, the influences it absorbed, and the new trends it established.

So far, it was felt that the history of sculptural art in the Deccan started with the reliefs from the Vihāra cave at Bhājā assignable to *circa* 2nd century B.C. on account of stylistic considerations. These sculptures, which are carved in low relief, having typical head-dresses and ornaments more related to the Śuṅga terracotta art, represent the contact western India may have had with the school of sculpture that had developed in the Madhya-deśa of which Bharhut is perhaps the best example. At Pitalkhora, however, a series of sculptures, some characterised by archaic naiveté and others with individuality of their own have been brought to light. The sculpture of Yaksha acting as *dvārapāla* from the *chaitya*-cave is an outstanding piece of sculpture meriting our attention. In its present state with the portion below the thighs missing, the sculpture is 5 ft. 6 in., so that its total height, when complete, must have been about 7 ft. Unlike the other sculptures of western India the figure is adorned with a very elaborate wig-like head-dress, which covers the ears and is fronted on the crest by a circular knot with an oblong protrusion in the centre. Two heavy serpent-ornaments *(sarpa-kuṇḍalas)* are attached to the lobes of the ears, the upper part of which has fan-like folds. Round the neck is a broad *graiveyaka* impressed with rosettes. From over the left shoulder run down the schematic folds of the upper garment *(uttarīya)* crossing the decorated belt *(chhannavīra)*, which comes down from the right shoulder. The round and bold modelling of the face contrasts with the flattish treatment of the body, which may indicate a stage of transition and indecisiveness on the part of the sculptor. One wonders whether the bold treatment of the face can be likened to the similar treatment of the Mauryan Yaksha and Yakshī figures and the flattish treatment of the body to that usually met with in the Śuṅga sculpture. The struggle in the mind of the artist to evolve a new form is clearly evident in this sculpture. The vigour and the absolute abandon noticeable in the Karla Mithuna sculptures is not in the least to be noticed in this figure, save an expression of gentle smile depicted on the face. It is also significant that the figure is extremely smooth and one wonders whether there was an unconscious attempt to emulate the Mauryan polish.

The other unique sculpture of Yaksha from Pitalkhora may now be examined. This sculpture represents a standing corpulent male Yaksha with hands raised upwards to hold a shallow bowl. As a piece of sculpture it betrays a fine sense of modelling, in spite of its heaviness, and would thus rank as one of the finest sculptures of its class in early Indian art. There can be little doubt that this sculpture provided a model for the Yakshas on the Western Gateway of Sanchi. The inscription carved on the outer right palm of the figure is of more than usual interest. Clearly engraved in letters of the second century B.C., the inscription reads: *Kaṇhadāsena* *hiraṇakārenakatā*, 'made by Kaṇhadāsa (Sanskrit Kṛishṇadāsa), a goldsmith.' This, however, is not the only inscription mentioning the sculptor's name that we get in the Deccan. The other inscription of this type occurs at Kondane which had not been properly interpreted. It occurs close to a sculpture, which incidentally also happens to be a Yaksha figure and reads as follows: *Kaṇhasa antevāsinā bālakena katam*, 'made by Bālaka the disciple of Kaṇha (Sanskrit Kṛishṇa).' This inscription was so far taken to refer to the excavation of the *chaitya* at Kondane. But this cannot be the case as it is so close to the sculpture that it cannot but refer to the Yaksha in question. The study of these two inscriptions has emboldened me to suggest that the Yaksha from Kondane was carved by the disciple of Kaṇha or Kaṇhadāsa, the goldsmith who carved the above mentioned Yaksha image from Pitalkhora. On palaeographic grounds, the inscriptions would appear to belong to about the second century B.C., to which period the caves are also attributed on the basis of architectural peculiarities. While Kaṇha carved the inscription on the outer palm of the Yaksha image because it was a loose piece, his pupil Bālaka who produced a relieve sculpture of the same class on a grand scale, chose to record his name and that of his teacher very close to the product of his craftsmanship. Had this sculpture survived in its pristine form, it would have been the most colossal and magnificent sculpture of its class.

Again reverting to the inscription on the Pitalkhora Yaksha image, I may point out that it does not record the donation of Kaṇha the goldsmith for carving the image, but it is a record of a sculptor who actually fashioned the image. The usual inscription recording donations found all over western India, end with the word *dānam* or *deyadhamma*. Besides, the casual '*kāritam*' is not employed to indicate that it was got made by the donor. This would clearly establish that the image in question was fashioned by the goldsmith who took to stone carving. Do we not have a similar instance in the ivory carvers of Vidiśā, taking to stone sculpture? It would further be of interest to examine the Yaksha figure and see how every detail of the ornaments worn by the Yaksha; spiral earrings *(kuṇḍalas)*, the *graiveyaka* around the neck, the *maṇimālā* of gadrooned and collared beads containing the human-faced amulets, the three-plaited armlets *(keyūra)* with the hook-appendages at the end and the circular and coiled wristlets all bear the stamp of the minute workmanship of a goldsmith who has taken to a new medium of stone and used the chisel and hammer like an accomplished stone sculptor. His mastery in the execution of details is also manifest in the treatment of the folds of the drapery and the twisted rolls of hair. This technical perfection coupled with the refined sense of modelling and the expression of mirth has endowed this sculpture with a distinction of its own. The use of a different and hard material to work upon has not deterred the artist but has brought out the best in him and thus we see the foundation of a school of sculpture being laid in the heart of the country ruled by the Sātavāhanas. The same technical perfection is noticeable in the treatment of the head-dress of the Yaksha image from Kondane which was the handiwork of his pupil Bālaka. A new inscription found at Pitalkhora (already referred to by me in my article on Pitalkhora in *Ancient India*, no. 15), gives us further information about this Kaṇha. The inscription occurs above the sculpture of the horse carved beyond the row of elephants on the right side. It reads as follows:

Line 1: *(Dhe)nuk(aka)tasa Samasa putena Ka*
Line 2: *ṇhena kata*

'Done by Kaṇha (Kṛishṇa), the son of Sama, of Dhenukakata(?)'. Kaṇha appears to have been the native of Dhenukākaṭa and it is not unlikely that he was responsible not merely for carving out the almost life-size sculpture of the horse but very probably the entire row of nine elephants and the gateway guarded by the *dvārapāla* figures all carved in a line in the plinth of the *vihāra*.

The school of sculpture thus commenced by the *Hiraṇyakāra* later attracted adherents from allied craftsmen, for does not the appellation *Sela-vaḍahkin* appearing in the inscription of the time of rājan Gotamiputra Sāmīsiri Yajña Śatakarṇī in the *chaitya*-cave at Kanheri, indicate that the carpenters also took to stone sculpture. Thus we find the emergence and development of art of stone sculpture by the indigenous artists and craftsmen who produced masterpieces of sculpture untrammelled by ageold conventions. Nowhere in the entire range of sculpture in the Deccan, do we find the representation of any deity except perhaps the Sūrya and Indra sculptures from Bhaja which as pointed out earlier, appear to have been done under the influence of the Madhya-deśa school dominated by the Śuṅga art. Some scholars have also identified these reliefs to an Avadāna story where the victorious march of King Māndhātā over the country of Uttarakuru is represented. The only objects of worship depicted in the western India caves are the Nāgas, Yakshas and the Gajalakshmī whose worship must have been one of hoary antiquity and their depiction therefore quite natural. Leave aside the gods and goddesses, even the *śālabhañjikā* figures usually to be met with in contemporary art of Mathura are conspicuous by their absence. Donor couples, robust and joyous, sometimes depicted as dancing with a gay abandon are depicted but in doing this there is no touch of sensuality which is so apparent in the Mathura school of sculpture. The *dvārapāla* Yaksha guarding the entrance to the *chaitya* at Nasik marks a further stage of development and the beginning of a climax we notice at Karla. There is break in the early tradition of the depiction of the Yaksha figures and the Yaksha has more human physiognomy akin to the male partner in the *mithuna* panels at Karla, Kuda and Kanheri. The diminutive panels on the facade of Kondane provide a model for the grouping of the panels and the bold experiment at depicting the donor couples is brought to fruition at Karla. The carving of pillar capitals which starts on a rather traditional note in the Pitalkhora or Bhaja caves is soon replaced by those vivacious and superb specimens of elephant-rider adorning the pillars in *chaitya*-hall at Karla. The winged animals tamely sitting back to back on the Pitalkhora pillar-capitals are metamorphosed into a burst of activity by the imaginative artists, and the specimens from Karla and a few from Nasik are masterpieces of sculptures of this class. The male and female riders stand for the royalty of the Sātavāhana kings who are shown proceeding for the worship of the *stūpa* riding on their royal elephants. The figure sculpture of the elephant-riders is almost in the round and we find that the Sātavāhana school of art had reached its culmination in about the first century A.D. The palmy days of this artistic exuberence did not, however, last long and the ebbing of the tide is noticeable in the sculptures at Kanheri. The *mithuna* figures from Kanheri, though in the tradition of Karla, are not full of vigour. The pillar-capitals from Kanheri depict the contrast very strikingly, for the elephant-riders are diminutive and the capitals do not at all harmonize with the architectural scheme of the *chaityagṛiha*. The facade of the Gautamīputra Vihāra at Nasik (Cave 3), while representing all the early features in the form of the caryatide Yakshas, pillar-capitals and *dvārapāla* Yakshas depicts the growing contact Deccan was having with the Amaravati school. This is apparent in the friezes carved on the architrave and the panel inside the *vihāra* on the back wall depicting the worship of a *stūpa* by female worshippers, carved in half relief. Incidentally, it may also be mentioned that the sculptured door jambs of the entrance doorway of this *vihāra*, provide a model for the door-frames of the Mahāyāna Vihāra Caves at Ajanta.

In the light of the above consideration, if we try to visualize the development of figure-sculpture in western India, a stylistic sequence could be worked out as follows:

1. Pitalkhora *Dvārapāla* Yaksha, the inscribed Yaksha in the round and the *dvārapāla* figures at the stopped entrance to the *vihāra*.
2. Kondane cave sculpture, especially the Yaksha image.
3. Yaksha at entrance of the *chaitya*-cave at Nasik.
4. Donor couples from Karla and Kuda.
5. *Dvārapāla* sculptures at the Gautamīputra Vihāra at Nasik.
6. *Mithuna* panels from the Kanheri *chaitya*.

These are the broad landmarks in which Bhājā is an intrusive element appearing about the same period as 1 and 2 of the above sequence. The artists of the Deccan who appear to breathe in the fresh air preferred to evolve their own style and, therefore, broke away from the conventional Śuṅga tradition.

As regards the depiction of the elephant, I have already noted my observations in my paper on Pitalkhora sculpture, where I have pointed out that the Pitalkhora elephant figures shown as half projecting forward from the rock have their prototype in their Mauryan counterpart at Dhauli in Orissa. In the later examples of the same class, I may point out one more instance and that is the elephant sculpture from a cave at Kuda on the western coast. This cave also contains sculptured *mithuna* panels similar to those at Karla.

The depiction of Nāga as an object of worship is also of some interest. In the early caves at Pitalkhora, Kondivati, Thanala and Nasik, the Nāga is represented in its animal form though in the last mentioned cave, it is much diminished in size. It is further interesting to note that the Nāga makes its appearance again but in a semi-human form on the *vedikā* of the *chaitya*-cave at Kanheri. In the Mahāyāna sculpture at Ajanta, Nāgadeva sculptures are carved on the entrance door-jambs of caves and also make their appearance as individual sculptures at prominent places.

The earliest depiction of Gajalakshmī is at Pitalkhora, but we also find this deity depicted at Thanala, a cave in the Sudhagadh *taluk* of the Kolaba District.

Before we end the discussion about the Deccan sculpture, let me refer in passing to the Amaravati school which also flourished under Sātavāhana patronage. The Jaggayapetta sculpture and early phase of Amaravati can be equated on the basis of similarity of pillar-capitals, to the early phase at Pitalkhora. The loose slabs found at Pitalkhora, one depicting the 'Great Departure' and the other probably portraying a Jātaka scene, also belong to Phase I of Amaravati. Excepting these two narrative scenes in the Deccan, there is no other sculptured panel depicting Jātaka stories. The narrative panel is the speciality of the Amaravati school and this is mainly the result of the material the artist worked upon. The limestone slabs available in the Andhra country lent themselves better to the sculpture in low relief as against massive sculpture in deeper relief which could conveniently be carved in the trap rock of the Deccan. The development of the Amaravati school on a different style can thus be explained.

The Sanchi sculpture, though produced under Sātavāhana patronage, owes its development to a different influence, namely, the Bharhut and therefore has to be treated as a separate branch.

Reverting back to the consideration of the Deccan sculpture we notice that from the second century A.D. the art activity in the Deccan appears to have received a setback. But before we close this discussion, I must make a reference to a more popular plastic art that was thriving in the Deccan with its centre at Tagara, an ancient emporium on the trade-route connecting Bharukachchha on the western coast with Masaulipatnam on the east. I refer here to the art of making terracotta figurines. The special feature of this terracotta art is its specialized technique of making hollow terracottas in the round by means of moulds, one for the front and the other for the back of the figure. This technique was copied from the Romans who came to western India in large numbers in the beginning of the Christian era. The casting of bronze images and carving in ivory were also practised. Painting on the walls of caves and palaces was also an accomplished art and in the Cave no. 9 and 10 at Ajanta we notice the beginning of this great art. The later development of this art under the Vākāṭaka patronage is a fact too well known to us.

The exuberance of all these arts cannot but be the result of royal patronage and it may not therefore be wrong to postulate the existence of a school of art which we may conveniently call as the Sātavāhana school of art. If we glance at the history of art right from the Mauryan to the Mughal period of Indian history, do we not find that artistic activity has at every stage received a fresh boost under the patronage of dynasties of individual monarchs?"

In the course of discussion Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray observed: "Before you say Sātavāhana school of art, you have to prove that it is out and out a court art. If you cannot prove it, then the nomenclature is wrong. The Pitalkhora sculpture raises a question. The problem before the artist was to give a relative rounded modelling of the physical form, and yet follow a two dimensional treatment of the ornaments. It is from the sculptor's point of view—what was the problem he was trying to solve—that a work has to be judged. Mere archaeological interpretations do not help. Also, there was no justification for the juxtaposition of elephants from Pitalkhora and Kuda as they involved different sculptural problems. Two movements in two different centres may have two completely separate geneses. Pitalkhora and Karle *mithuna* figures are altogether different. Why try to bring them into one straight line? We need not be surprised that the ivory-makers were also sculptors or sculptors were also painters. The kind of specialization we know today was not known at that time. The same person could be a scribe, a sculptor, and a carpenter. If the palaeographical evidence gives second century B.C. date, then the palaeographical evidence is to be taken with a grain of salt. The Pitalkhora sculpture cannot be pre-Christian. One need not go into raptures over the aesthetic qualities of the sculpture."

Sri Krishna Deva was unable to find any Mauryan element in the earliest Pitalkhora sculptures. In his opinion it would be better to call the art Early Deccan influenced by Śuṅga art. He was also unable to find any Amaravati element in the sculptures illustrated. Finally, the Kondane sculpture, he suggested, may be the representation of Kāmadeva.

Dr. K. K. Ganguli saw the conflict between the views expressed by Sri M. N. Deshpande and Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray as one of approach. Sri Deshpande tried to put before us a study of the material, a proximity in time and place, while Dr. Ray tried to evolve a stylistic approach.

Dr. Mulk Raj Anand endorsed the first four points made by Prof. Ray. In his opinion, archaeologists, art-historians and even casual observers should join together to try and evolve a method which would fit in with the peculiar problems of art-history in India.

Sri K. D. Bajpai doubted the use of the terminology "Sātavāhana School of Art." He thought that palaeographical evidence which placed the Pitalkhora sculpture in the second century B. C. was doubtful and that perhaps the script belonged to the first century A.D. He did not agree with Sri Krishna Deva that the figures from Kondane was the representation of Kāmadeva.

Dr. Moti Chandra felt that a central point of Sri Deshpande's appeal was being missed. In answer to Sri Bajpai, he observed that the script of the Pitalkhora inscription could never be dated to the first century A.D. on any ground. In his opinion, Sri Deshpande had shown the technique and evolution of a new school of sculpture. Sri Deshpande's chronological order may or may not stand scrutiny in future but there was no doubt that in the present state of knowledge he had arranged his material logically.

Sri Pramod Chandra was of the opinion that there was an extreme danger in trying to date sculptures by inscriptions. The art-historian must rely more on style, and the changes it undergoes in the course of centuries. Inscriptions must be substantiated by stylistic and other analyses. Furthermore, it should be realized that Sri Deshpande had been discussing his material, while Dr. Ray had been discussing methodology.

Dr. Anand Krishna felt that the general framework, presented by Sri Deshpande, suited the general trend of Indian art-history. Regarding the problem of nomenclature, one must consider whether a particular class of sculpture flourished under a certain dynasty; and if it did, some allowances about its nomenclature had to be made.

Dr. J. N. Banerjea suggested that a critical approach to inscriptions is always advisable. Though Sri Deshpande's chronology may be questioned, one must give him the credit of evolving a sequence in the Deccan sculpture.

Sri M. N. Deshpande in answer to the point raised by Sri Krishna Deva regarding Amaravati influence, stated that a number of limestone slabs of the Amaravati school have been found at Ter and a number of *stūpas* also, which remain to be excavated. At Karle there is a *stūpa* in half relief, exactly as at Amaravati. In answer to a point raised by Dr. Ray, he was of the opinion that a craftsman working in one medium was bound to leave the mark of his technique if he works through another craft. In this case we had a goldsmith who had adopted the profession of a sculptor. This may also account for the detailed treatment of the ornaments. As for the objection regarding his dating, Sri Deshpande reminded the groups that he had not suggested any dates in the paper. As the participants had asked him questions regarding the dating, he had suggested possible dates. In his opinion, while dealing with the question of date all available evidence including palaeographical and architectural had to be used. He pointed out that it was palaeographical evidence only which had fixed the date of Bhājā to the second century B.C. He failed to understand why the same principle should not be applied to Pitalkhora. Sri Deshpande defended his use of the word "masterpiece" in describing the Pitalkhora Yaksha and contended that it was ultimately a matter of opinion and personal reaction, but he stoutly maintained that from every angle it was a great piece of art.

Sri. M. N. Deshpande was followed by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri who read the following summary of his paper entitled 'Some Problems of Kushāṇa and Sātavāhana Art":

"1. The Kushāṇas and the Sātavāhanas were two contemporary dynasties of imperial rulers, reigning over two distinct regions of India,—the northwest and the central respectively—between *circa* 200 B.C. and *circa* 250 A.D., the latter beginning a little earlier than the former and ending also a little later. Political imperial dynasties do not spring up overnight. Their nucleii generally precede them by decades, if not by centuries. And the Kushāṇas and the Sātavāhanas are no exception. Their artistic and cultural attainments must have also undergone an evolutionary process before showing their individualities. In a discussion, therefore, of the art problems of the two regions, we must take cognizance of these antecedent forces.

2. The Kushāṇas were foreigners, having more racial contacts with the Bactrian Greeks and the Śaka-Pahlava Iranians than with the settled races of Hindu India. They

themselves were of a tribe of partially nomadic habits, driven out of their original haunts by successive waves of invading tribes. Barring the Śaka-Pahlava interlude of a few decades, they were the inheritors of the earlier Graeco-Bactrian city-culture. The city of Mathura, on the banks of the Jamuna, was their cultural centre. The view that they were also the distributors of Hellenic culture and art in India needs revision in the light of modern researches.

3. When art-historians refer to Gandhāra art of the second and the first centuries B.C., they often use the misleading expression 'Graeco-Bactrian' and 'Indo-Greek', implying its Greek affiliations if not altgether a Greek origin. But one has to be very careful to distinguish 'artistic origin' from the 'Historic accident of birth in a locality and period of an Empire.'

4. The supposed first occurrence of the human image of the Buddha in Gandhāra at the period of the Bactrian Empire has been quoted as evidence of dominant Hellenistic influence in Indian art. But India too had its own indigenous tradition of art, representing her Hindu gods and goddesses in human forms. The Bharhut *stūpa* railing, which is definitely pre-Bactrian in date, contains a seated Mahālakshmī. There are references in the *Mahābhāshya* of Patañjali to *chitras* (three-dimensional sculpture) of Kṛishṇa fighting with and killing Kamsa and of Vishṇu binding Mahābali. Patañjali, again, uses the term *archā* to denote an image of a deity of worship. He even refers to the Mauryas as having sold images of worship for obtaining gold. Even Kauṭilya refers to the installation of the images of Śiva and Vaiśravaṇa in temples. The carving of images of gods and goddesses is noticed and recorded by the companions of Alexander; it is, therefore, not a Bactrian importation, but a pre-Bactrian growth. This

conclusion does not deny the influence of Greek technique on indigenous art directly or indirectly.

5. The occurrence of technically advanced coins in Bactria need not necessarily imply the existence of advanced Hellenistic sculpture also in that area. Even crudest terracottas occur side by side with the best specimens of art in stone in some civilizations. But it must be remembered that in the so-called Gandhāra art, there were two distinct periods of development—the earlier revealing Parthian influence and the later suggesting Roman and Egyptian influences.

6. Full, over-emphasised, symmetrical breasts of women in studied poses and statues of men standing still, clothed in rhythmic folds of garments, are characteristic elements of Indian, Parthian and Egyptian stylized techniques. The former element abounds in Mauryan, Śuṅga and Mathura art, while the latter is the most striking feature of the so-called Gandhāra or 'Indo-Greek' art. Photographic likenesses of human forms in natural flexible poses and draped in flowing, symmetrical folds of costumes hanging or waving in the air, are the characteristics of Hellenic and early Roman art techniques. Barring stray finds of a couple or two of such genuinely Greek pieces of sculpture in Bactria (which can be explained as imported models), it is extremely difficult to pick out instances of such classical technique in the so-called 'Indo-Greek' school, and very much more so in the later Kushāṇa school.

7. The Parkham and Pawaya Yakshas of the pre-Bactrian Mathura school, with their sensuous poses and stylized monotonous folds of garments, and the Mauryan '*chauri*-bearer' (Didarganj) of the Patna Museum, are evidences of the pre-existence of a distinctly indigenous Indian

school, emphasising dance-poses and sentiments more than physical anatomy.

8. It, therefore, stands to reason to suggest that the Kushāṇa art, which abounds in such representations of Yakshas and Yakshīs and is, therefore, supposed to be a child of Indo-Greek art, was in reality a child of the Mathura school, but brought up in the Graeco-Bactrian atmosphere. The rounded breasts of these dryads of the gateways and *toraṇas* of Sanchi and Bharhut unmistakably point to an older Indian technique. But the heavy folds of drapes hanging behind these transparently clothed damsels, though still stylized imperceptibly, and the placement of some foliage or tree close by, seem to approximate in artistic motif to the Greek and early Roman dishabille techniques.

9. Although Greek and Roman sculpture abound in representations of the 'Nude' even in sacred temples, such a phenomenon is conspicuously absent in Gandhāra sculpture. This is explained as due to the strictly monastic character of Buddhism. But the gateways of Bharhut and Sanchi *stūpas*, which were no less monastic institutions of Buddhism, display most prominently dozens of transparently clothed and aggressively sensuous *vṛikshakas* with prominent sex-organs attracting the first attention of every pilgrim entering those monuments for worship. Such representations, however, are absent in the rails of the *stūpas* proper, which happen to be older in date. What could be the motive of the builders of the gateways or *toraṇas* in such a display? This is a problem that needs a convincing explanation.

10. One of the famous pieces of 'Indo-Bactrian' sculpture is the emaciated, skeleton-like image of the Buddha, when he was experimenting with bodily mortification as a

means of salvation. The particular artisan who executed it seems to have been ignorant of the number of ribs a man can have, for he has shown sixteen pairs of ribs protruding from the skinny frame of the holy one. Since human anatomy was the strongest point of Hellenic and Roman art, this particular piece of sculpture could not have emanated from a classical artist or his pupil. It must be the handiwork of some ill-informed Indian artisan, soaked in the traditional 'cliches' of Indian stylization, but trying to imitate unsuccessfully later Egyptian technique.

11. But there are some genuinely Hellenic pieces—e.g., 'An Atlante' (G. 818) now preserved in the Lahore Museum—which display correct anatomical knowledge and cent-per cent Roman technique. It is also stated to have been found in the Gandhāra region. There are some more pieces of the above type too discovered elsewhere in the Bactrian Empire. It is reasonable to state that all that have been unearthed in the Bactrian region need not necessarily be Indo-Greek in origin. Some might have come directly from Greece, and might have served as models for local artisans. It is plain, therefore, that the so-called Indo-Greek and the Kushāṇa art of ancient India were products of Indian workmanship, executed under Indian supervision, with but one or two pairs of specimens of Greek, Roman and Egyptian pieces to serve as models.

12. There is a headless inscribed statue of Kanishka at the Mathura Museum. It is certainly a product of the Kushāṇa period. It had a sword and a dagger hanging alongside a long coat. The pants are in tediously monotonous folds and the feet are shoe-clad and shown with toes turned towards opposite directions. The statue definitely portrays a

still pose, facing the spectator. Similar or almost similar specimens of statuary have been recently unearthed in the Mesopotamian region of Hatra, seventy miles southwest of Mosul. They too have been dated in the same period as the Kushāṇa and are regarded as specimens of Parthian art. Since Parthia had the greatest political and cultural contacts with the Kushāṇas, next only to India proper, parallel developments of the same technique have occurred in two distant lands in the same epoch of history. This perhaps needs a closer study.

13. The Amaravati sculptures too were not all of one period, although the Sātavāhana dynasty was in power most of the time. Art historians divided them into four periods of development, which seems to be sensible. The earliest period (*circa* 100 B.C.) came at the fag end of Gandhāra art. It has, therefore, been supposed to be a continuation of the latter. But the human image of the Buddha is conspicuous by its absence. The Bodhi-tree, the *stūpa*, the wheel, the engraved feet, and the *tri-ratna* are the symbols used for worship. When Buddhism, with its periodical councils and roving missionaries taking stock of their achievements and programming plans of work, was in constant intimate contact with all the regions of India and South Asia (unlike the immobile Hinduism of that era), how can Amaravati alone escape the Gandhāran influence and stick to the older puritan practice of worshipping the symbols? It is all the more puzzling, because the Buddha images appear in the later periods of Amaravati sculpture side by side with the symbols.

14. Some of the Sātavāhana sculpture, occurring in the later periods, reveal a greater perfection of technique. The human forms are more natural, though posed in multifarious actions of the body, suggesting definitely Greek and Roman

influences. Nevertheless, the technique of draping costumes has degenerated from even the crude standards attained in the Gandhāra period. Some scholars—particularly from Italy—argue that Roman art of the same period had also similar decadent characteristics and they deduce therefrom that Indian art had copied that decadent technique, forgetting the fact that India was the home of that technique for several centuries before Rome. Sheer commonsense favours the opposite view of a reverse process of art-traffic, viz., that Roman art had been influenced by the Indian. But this too needs a closer scrutiny.

15. Sātavāhana architecture, on the other hand, had advanced considerably. Rock-cut caves and cave temples in the western ghats show a definite improvement from the Mauryan and the Khāravela excavations of Bihar and Orissa respectively. Since Egypt was the mother of the art of excavating rock-cut cave-temples and the east as well as the west coasts of India happen to be the very regions where Yavana and Roman commercial and cultural penetrations had taken place in those centuries, scholars like A. K. Coomaraswamy argue that Egyptian engineers must have been there to direct Indian workmen. The possibility that an Indian dialect had crept into an Egyptian comedy of that period lends support to his view of intimacy of contact and intercourse between the two countries. If A. K. Coomaraswamy's surmise is correct, it naturally follows that these foreign architects must have transmitted their skill to some of their progeny in India. Were they the nucleii of the later school of Indian *sthapatis* and *śilpis* of south India? Were they the inspirers of the later written treatises on Indian architecture too? This problem also requires a deeper study."

Sri Krishna Deva asked what it was that Prof. Nilakanta

Sastri felt was Egyptian about Western Indian architecture-plan, design, monumentation, or the very idea of excavation in rock?

Prof. Nilakanta Sastri replied that it was the monumental character of the work; the very idea of excavating.

Dr. P. M. Joshi pointed out that while Egyptian cave work was done in the second millennium B.C., the Western Indian caves were begun in the 2nd century B.C. If Indian contacts with Egypt had to be established then a large span of over 1000 years between the two types of monuments had to be bridged.

Prof. Nilakanta Sastri pointed out a similar problem in megalithic monuments, where a span of over 1000 years existed between the megalithic monuments in Western Europe and India.

Dr. P. M. Joshi, however, suggested that it was quite possible for two different groups to hit upon the same idea, and felt that there was no question of borrowing from Egypt.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, in taking up the question of the *vṛikshakas* of Sanchi, suggested that its symbolism must be sought in the fertility cults. Symbols and factual representations co-exist in the same work of art. Symbols are nothing but abstractions of concrete experiences. He strongly objected to the description of rock-cut caves as architecture. The caves must be approached from the point of view of sculpture rather than of architecture.

Sri A. Ghosh, in discussing para 11 of Prof. Sastri's summary, suggested that the problem of origin could be solved in this case by resorting to archaeological methods. If the rock is of Indian origin the sculpture had been carved locally, if the rock is not Indian, it had been carved abroad.

Sri M. N. Deshpande said that the architects who fashioned the rock-cut caves had as their model contemporary wooden architecture, and the result they had in mind was architecture sculptured in stone.

Dr. A. K. Narain discussed the use of the terms "Indo-Greek" or "Bactrian" and suggested their mixed origin containing a strong Indian element. He further observed that many problems of art could be solved by the study of Central Asian motifs.

Dr. K. K. Ganguli referred to the term "Parthian", as used in Taxila. Their origin was Iranian, though they were highly Hellenized.

Dr. Mulk Raj Anand, in discussing rock-cut caves, which he preferred to call "carving", referred to Sri Kausambi's suggestion that they were built along the trade routes to the Deccan. Assyrian and Babylonian motifs may have come through this trade.

Prof. J. N. Banerjea, summarising the discussion, concluded that there was no evidence suggesting Egyptian influence on Western Indian caves. The point raised by Dr. Ray regarding the name was quite interesting, and we could consider "rock-cut carvings" as an appropriate nomenclature.

Dr. K. K. Ganguli then read out a short paper summarised below on the "Kushāṇa Sculpture and Terracottas from Bengal" which evoked no discussion.

"Till very recently it was generally believed that there was nothing much to know about Bengal prior to the Pāla period. The delta in stretch of low alluvium widely covered with tropical vegetation also has been discouraging to any intensive enquiry about its remote past. Vedic and post-Vedic literature is reluctant to concede the existence of culture in Bengal. In these circumstances it was not quite unreasonable that some sculptures found from north Bengal, though strongly reminiscent of Kushāṇa sculpture of Mathura were attributed somewhere about the eighth century A.D. A few Gupta inscriptions discovered some years ago from north Bengal had pushed the horizon in the history of this part of India, though the antiquity of culture in Bengal is fully established by the discovery of a Mauryan inscription. In recent time some archaeological explorations carried out in limited areas have yielded sufficient evidence to prove that the civilization in this part of the country has not been a comparatively recent phenomenon. An artistic tradition contained in sculpture and terracotta figures found from different parts has been a distinctive feature of this civilization of Bengal.

The art of making figurines in different media has been one of the very early achievements of man and in Bengal. This art appears to have passed through various stages. Broadly speaking the epochs of the early development of this art in Bengal conform to the general evolutionary epochs met in other parts of India. It is significant that up to the end of the Gupta period art objects found from different parts of India more or less followed a common idiom of expression which finally yielded to regional styles. Though it cannot be said in the present state of our knowledge whether Bengal was ever ruled by the Imperial Kushāṇas yet some sculpture as well as many terracotta figures found from different parts of Bengal bear striking affinity to objects of Kushāṇa period from Mathura and can in all fairness be attributed to the same age.

Among the stone sculpture a fragmentary and sandstone figure, probably representing Buddha and found from Chandraketugarh, is typical of the Buddha-Bodhisattva style of Mathura. This figure was probably brought from Mathura by some devout pilgrim but there are three sculptures in the Rajshahi Museum which though stylistically close to the Kushāṇa sculpture of Mathura were executed locally by artists of Bengal. Apart from these figures a few figures of Vishṇu found from lower Bengal and now in the Asutosh Museum can also be attributed to the Kushāṇa tradition from the point of view of style.

The range of terracotta figures found from some archaeological sites of Bengal record a greater affiliation to the Kushāṇa idiom of terracottas found from Mathura as well as from other sites of northern India such as Kauśāmbī, Sahet Mahet, Rajghat (Banaras) and the like. These terracottas are mostly figures in the round of an average height of three to four inches. The heads in most of these figures were made in moulds while the body was modelled with fingers. More often the eyes, breasts and ornaments were made separately and fixed in the appliqué technique. Heads and head-gears in many of these figures signify types representing individuals belonging to different racial and national groups. The producers of these figures appear to have observed with open eyes the various race movements which were going on around them. People coming from various corners of the world under the enlightened protection and encouragement of the Kushāṇa rulers travelled along the roads of this country, attired in their divergent costumes, adding jest and merriment to the already gay and joyous life of the country. The artists viewed this with appreciation and have left the warmth of their reaction in this widely varying terracotta figures as true and vivid records of a vigorous time.

These terracotta figures found from different sites such as Bangarh and Berachampa, Tamluk and Mahasthangarh, separated from each other by many scores of miles reveal that the urban culture had reached a great height here and art had become a faithful handmaid of this culture.

The *Purāṇas* record that certain Devarakshitas ruled in eastern India just before the Guptas had gained power in Magadha. Some scholars have tried to identify these people with a branch of the Kushāṇas. These hitherto unknown stone and terracotta figures of Bengal, together with the numerous Kushāṇa and later Kushāṇa coins found here, in all probability go a long way in confirming that Bengal had some direct Kushāṇa influence which could have been responsible for such a pronounced Kushāṇa affinity in the art tradition of Bengal."

Dr. Mulk Raj Anand then summarised his paper on the "Origin of the Buddha Image," which was followed by a short paper by Anand Krishna on the same subject.

1. The difficulties of historical estimates about epochs in India's past, where little or no documentary evidence about social and political conditions is available. The importance of cultural remains as the basis for *insight* into the past historical processes. The necessity for art historians to admit literary and metaphorical evidence and art objects in their Universe of discourse and to apply the imagination for gaining of *insight*. The resulting *insight* is important not only from the point of view of curiosity but because the impulse of the vitality of the past is necessary for the present in order to build the future.

2. The falsifications, exaggerations and bitter contro-

versy about the past resulting from the emphasis on facts by archaeologists and on sentiment by nationalists. One of the important examples of such a controversy being the influence of Greek on Indian art, particularly in regard to the Buddha image, about half a century ago. The protagonists, Prof. Grünwedel and A. Foucher on the one hand and Ananda Coomaraswamy on the other, both having been proved to be partial and dogmatic in holding their different points of view, in the light of the more comprehensive evidence which has now become available to prove the compositeness of India's ancient culture, specially in the pre-Maurya and post-Maurya periods.

3. The topography of northern Panjab, Afghanistan and Central Asia, was very different from what it is today. And as there has been no imaginative reconstruction of that unstable period, when they were frequent comings and goings of foreigners into India, the social and political life of that time remains an almost closed chapter of Indian history. The travel diaries of the Chinese monks and later Arab and Mughal memoirs alone give us a few hints. Presumably, however, the landscape was rich and fertile, with plentiful harvests and important Buddhist and Hindu religious centres flourished, where different nationalities met.

4. Although there was the need only for abstract symbolism in the Vedic Aryan period, the Dravidian cult images were throughout popular. And in the epic narratives there is mention of the tradition of image-making. The earlier Buddhist faith did not encourage the representation of the Buddha, though some images seem to have been made of the Enlightened One for the benefit of worshippers. The main symbols of Buddhism, however, remain abstract: the lotus, the Bodhi-tree, the feet of the Buddha and the *stūpas*, symbols

of which were used for worship. The indigenous craftsmen also did narrative reliefs of the Jātaka stories with human figures. There is no evidence of surviving portraits of the Buddha in the indigenous tradition. The style of portraiture of Buddha, however, developed, after Alexander's invasion, through Graeco-Roman craftsmen in northwest India, specially in Gandhāra. These portraits were in the naturalistic Greek tradition on the model of the Greek hero-gods. Ostensibly, these portraits of the Buddha became known south of Gandhāra. But while the Buddha as man-hero was made into an Apollo god in Gandhāra, in Mathura and elsewhere images of Buddha were idealised to represent a spiritual state of being, that is to say, carving of the Gandhāra Buddhas, therefore, differs entirely from the Buddha as a divine energy in the Hinduised Buddhist tradition of Mathura and the Ganges plains.

5. The transformation of Buddhist iconography may have been encouraged by Kanishka the Kushāṇa emperor, who had a second capital in Mathura, during the 1st century A.D. The interest of this prince in the new Mahāyāna doctrine of Buddhism, which embraced, with great tolerance, many of the ways of worship of the local peoples seem to have inspired a variety of images of the Buddhist pantheon, which was now built up on the parallel of the Hindu pantheon. The primitive tree spirits, the snake spirits, water gods, and other fanciful metaphors of Dravidian peoples also came into the favour. And many of the Greek customs and usages, such as drinking parties and festivals, were adopted both in active life and as artistic influences from Gandhāra.

6. Under the Kushāṇa emperors much intermixture, confusion and even synthesis took place. The Central Indian

tradition of carving absorbed several influences and evolved a vital, realistic art based on apperceptions of the introvert, imaginative vision. The carving in the round, with the curvative finish, became the dominant strain, as against the naturalism of Gandhāra. The transition from the rigidity and frontality of early Kushāṇa art to the gracious breathing stones of the Gupta phase is already on the way.

7. In the light of this stylistic interpenetration between Gandhāra and the local Indian tradition, the partisan theories of Grünwedel and Foucher that 'the ideal type of Buddha image was created by foreigners' are obviated, as much as the view of Coomaraswamy (that there was no Greek influence—that 'Alexander's influence on Indian culture must have been of the slightest' and that 'India was not Hellenised' and that 'she continued to live her life of splendid isolation and soon forgot the passing of the Macedonian storm') seems too summary a dismissal of what was in fact a pervasive influence.

8. The role of Kanishka and other Kushāṇa emperors, as the patrons of a joint Graeco-India and Central Indian composite culture, is important, in so far as they gathered up the Scythian, Parthian, Graeco-Roman and Central Indian strains under their benigning dynastic influence. The influence of the Indian poet, Aśvaghosha, author of the Life of the Buddha, through his friendship with the Emperor Kanishka, seems to have been decisive in the spiritualisation of the Kushāṇa tradition.

Dr. Anand Krishna said :

"The human representation of the Buddha is known only since the first century A.D. The Yaksha and Nāga images and other images of the folḳ divinities have been attributed to be the model on which the Buddha figure was based later on. However, there may have been some other forces also working towards the emergence of the Buddha figure.

The Buddha is known as the *Dharma Chakravartin* and therefore some royal attributions are also associated with his representation, for example, the *chhatra* or the *siṁhāsana*. It is not impossible that they were adopted from the Royal figures, which were known in a still earlier period, e.g., in the Devakula mentioned in the play *Pratimā* by Bhāsa and which tradition the Kushāṇa royal figures from Mathura belonged. Albeit the Yakshas were known as *mahārājas*, but even then the royal attributies must have been derived from royal figures.

The Buddha figure seems to have been influenced by the Jina figures, which, curiously enough, also begin to appear from the same early Kushāṇa period, which should not be a mere coincidence. As a matter of fact the existence of the Jina figure is known at least since the Nanda period (fourth century B.C.) as is evidenced by the Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela (early first century A.D.). Probably the Lohanipur nude male torso (*circa* third century B.C.) also represents the earliest Jina figure. Again the close relationship between the Jaina and Buddhist symbols in the Kushāṇa sculpture or architecture points to their co-existence.

In Bharhut bas-reliefs the figure of a monk which shows the upper garment exactly in the same manner, *i.e.*, showing the right shoulder draped and the right hand raised in the *abhaya-mudrā* as in the Buddha figure further lend support to the view that the Buddha figure originated in India."

At the suggestion of the moderator, the discussion of Dr. Mulk Raj Anand's paper and Dr. Anand Krishna's paper was taken up together.

Dr. J. N. Banerjea identified the Bharhut relief referred to by Dr. Anand Krishna as a representation of a Jātaka story, and the figure referred to as the representation of a Brāhmaṇa monk.

Sri D. P. Ghosh stated that Coomaraswamy's theory regarding the origin of the Buddha image was based on strict analysis. The Graeco-Roman artists floundered when they had to depict a god as a mendicant or beggar, but for Indians, the Buddha image came easily as the prototype was a common experience in everyday life.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray had no doubts that the Mathura type of Buddha images had something to do with the royal as well as Yaksha figures. All this had been pointed out by Coomaraswamy in his significant monograph. Anand Krishna had made a significant point regarding the mention of a Jina figure in the Hāthigumpha inscription. It was quite likely that Jaina images were made in the pre-Christian centuries. The form and dress of the figure in the Bharhut relief were also significant. No doubt it was the figure of a semi-divine being, and at least the type had some relationship with the origin of the Buddha image. Even at Mathura there was a slight hesitation in the minds of the sculptors to call the figures divine. They were the images of Buddha, but not called Buddha. The 'Year 2' image says "Bodhisattva", while the 'Year 3' image says 'Bhagavato Bodhisattva', thus pointing to a gradual evolution of the Buddha from the human to divine type.

Dr. S. K. Sarasvati stated that the term "Bhagavato" with reference to the Buddha was in use from still earlier days, from Bharhut onwards.

Sri Pramod Chandra felt there was a connection between the Yaksha and the Buddha form, and further researches may eventually pin down the origin of the Buddha image to the massive concept of Yaksha figures.

Dr. J. N. Banerjea, in summing up the discussion, thanked V. S. Agrawala for referring to the elements which made up the Buddha image. Gandhāra art tried to assimilate, in whatever way it could, the Indian elements, but concept was Indian, though geographical and other factors basically moulded the character of the Buddha figure from time to time. He also deplored the use of certain foreign terms such as extrovert and introvert in connection with the basic concept of the Buddha image.

K. D. Bajpai then read the following short proper on "Problems of Kushāṇa and Sātavāhana Art," which evoked no discussion.

"The explorations in Afghanistan and the discovery of Mathura have brought forth interesting material for a fresh consideration of the Kushāṇa chronology which is intimately connected with the study of the Kushāṇa art. The results of the recent excavations at Kauśāmbī, Śrāvastī and Mathura have also to be taken into consideration.

The question of the foreign influence on Mathura art requires a thorough appraisal.

A comparative study of the iconographic forms of the Indian deities, as depicted on the Kushāṇa coins, and their representations in contemporary plastic art is another desideratum. A detailed study of the Kushāṇa art of the north and northwestern India *vis-a-vis* the Sātavāhana art of western India and the Vengī region is necessary. The study of the terracotta art requires a thorough study on the lines recently adopted by Dr. Moti Chandra in the study of the ivory figurines."

The day's proceeding ended with the reading of the following summary of the paper entitled "Some Problems of Art and Iconography during the Age of the Kushāṇas and Śātavāhana," by Dr. J.N. Banerjea. (For the full text see Appendix A.)

"Indian art from the second half of the first century B.C. to the end of the third century A.D. or a little later can be placed under two broad geographical classifications, the first prevalent in northern India under the Śaka-Pahlava and the Kushāṇa hegemony, and the second in the Deccan under the Sātavāhana and the Kshatrapa rule. The first again can be divided roughly into two regional groups, the one confined to the limits of Gandhāra and its environs, and the other localised principally at Mathura and the adjoining regions. The art of India during the Sātavāhana period, on the other hand, was mainly associated with the western Deccan, though its offshoots spread to the eastern parts of peninsular India—to the Āndhradeśa proper, where it was soon to effloresce during the period of the Ikshvākus. It is needless to emphasise that all these phases of Indian art were mainly religious in character, and the religion best and most served by the artists was Mahāyāna Buddhism. Brahmanism and Jainism, as well as the folk religions like the Yaksha and the Nāga worship, did also engage the services of the artists during this fairly long period, but it was mainly the Madhyadeśa region of Mathura and a few other places nearby where evidence testifying to this fact is extant. The services of various kinds of artists and craftsmen, such as the architects, sculptors, metal-casters, potters and others were requisitioned by the pious people affiliated to various religions current at that time for the making of divine images and emblems, the shrines or the *devagṛihas* for properly housing them, the funerary monuments (*stūpas* with their various components), the reliquaries, terracotta and many other objects more or less intimately associated with ritual worship.

In studying the different art objects that are still extant in the north, some of the problems that confront one are the following :—

(a) The real nature of the constituents of this art, i.e., over and above the predominantly Indian element recognisable in them, what was the other principal element in its composition? Was it Hellenistic or Roman? It must be understood that the efflorescence of the Gandhāra art took place during the period of the Imperial Kushāṇas, some time after the end of the Bactrian Greek rule in northwest India. The contact of the early Kushāṇa kings and emperors from the time of Kujula Kadphises—Kadaphes to that of the Kanishka group of kings with the contemporary Roman world can be demonstrated with the help of their coins, and it is presumable that the main foreign element in the composite art of northwest India was Roman in character. But the use of the term 'Hellenistic' in designating it may also be partially justified, for the Roman art of the times was itself influenced by Hellenistic art. In this way the problem of naming the chief alien element in the composite art of Gandhāra may be solved.

(*b*) The other branch of the Śaka-Kushāṇa art of Mathura and the adjoining regions does not raise any real problem, for there is no controversy regarding its basic Indian character. Some supposed alien elements in it are of an adventitious nature, and such reliefs as the so-called "Bacchanalian scene" in red sandstone of Mathura in the collection of the Indian Museum can be explained in a different manner.

(*c*) There is now no real problem regarding the origin of the Buddha image, for most, if not all, indologists held the view that the iconisation of the Buddha took place simultaneously at Gandhāra and Mathura. The local artists of Mathura undoubtedly modelled the principal features of the Buddha image on those of the figures of the Yakshas and the Nāgas. It was suggested by Grünwedel and Foucher long ago that 'the Hellenistic Buddha' of Gandhāra was based originally on the 'Apollo model', and with 'the gradual idealisation' of the type it came to be more and more Indianised. But a consideration of some of the finest Buddha and Bodhisattva figures in the Peshawar and Lahore Museums, both standing and seated, leaves little doubt that the Indian elements in them can be specifically recognised. Yet it may even now be questioned whether the basic problem about the reasons for this iconisation has been satisfactorily solved. It is a fact that a century or so before this period, Buddha was being represented by means of an iconic symbol in Buddhist art of central India. What were the significant changes in the religious outlook of the Buddhists that were at the root of this innovation? Foucher tried to solve the problem by suggesting that the Indians were not at first accustomed to making divine images for worship, and so Buddha's images were not made by the artists of central India. It was the Hellenistic artists of Gandhāra, who were the first iconographers of Buddha according to his opinion, and it was also his indirect conclusion that images of gods and goddesses came to be made and worshipped after the iconisation of the Buddha. But our latest researches do not allow us to support this hypothesis. Scholars like O. C. Gangoly and others have tried to account for this phenomenon, but it seems that the last word has not yet been said on the subject.

(d) The coins of the Kushāṇa emperors like Wema Kadphises, Kanishka, Huvishka and Vāsudeva show that the images of such Brahmanical Hindu deities, like Śiva, Umā, Mahāsena were known at the time, for their figures were used as devices on them. But it is somewhat strange that when so many images of the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas have been discovered in Gandhāra and Mathura practically no images of the former group of divinities have been found there. The figures of Śiva on the coins of Kanishka, Huvishka and Vāsudeva show that there were varieties of images of this god in their times.

(e) Contemporary art was no doubt pre-eminently religious in character; but more durable remains of secular architecture of the period would have helped us to have a better and more comprehensive idea about the art of living during the period.

The observations made about the problems of art and iconography during the Śaka-Kushāṇa hegemony in north India can, with some modification, be made to the Deccanese art during the Sātavāhana hegemony. The rock-cut cave architecture of western Deccan, however, confronts us with a phenomenon which is practically absent in the almost contemporary art of north India. The hard-grained rock of Sahyādri and its spurs in the western Deccan served as the field of work of the local artists who plied their chisel for the secluded and restful habitations of the Buddhist monks belonging to different orders. These solitary spots of scenic beauty were ideal for their religious meditation, and it is no wonder that the Sātavāhana and other chiefs ruling over this region would make a grant of the rock-cut cave monasteries to the Buddhist monks. The massive architectural monuments of the region are still a wonder to art connoisseurs, and it is still a problem how the architects of the locality, who were presumably used for generations to the art of wood-carving could ply with so much skill, accuracy and artistry the stone-masons' chisel in these rock traps. There is no direct evidence anywhere in these magnificent monuments that the services of any foreign artist were used in their construction, though the names of some foreigners were recognised in the inscriptions found engraved in some of these caves.

There are also some problems attached with the dating of some of these cave monasteries like Karle and others, and several helpful studies have been made regarding their solution. Some problems are also associated with the interpretation of several reliefs carved on their facades (*cf.* those on the Bhaja cave facade).

The long depleted monuments (structural *vihāras*) at Amaravati and the remains at Nagarjunikonda in the Āndhra-deśa raise some problems of artistic and iconographic interest. Recent excavations at Nagarjunikonda have thrown a flood of light on the contemporary art and iconography of the region."

PROCEEDINGS ON THE SECOND DAY

Dr. V. S. Agrawala acted as moderator for the second day's proceedings, the subject for discussion being "Extensions of Gupta Art." The seminar opened with a short introduction by him in which he explained the basic concepts of Gupta art and how in the course of a few centuries it had not only spread in the far-lying corners of India, but had also crossed the confines of India and left a deep impression on the art of greater India.

On "Gupta Art and the Problems posed by the Mirpurkhas Terracottas" Dr. Moti Chandra read the paper with the help of slides.

"The paper draws attention to the sudden spurt of artistic activities in the Panjab and Western India including Sindh in the wake of cultural revival in the Gupta period. Political contacts with the frontier regions were established in the time of Samudragupta. We, however, do not know much about the factors which gave a new outlook to Gandhāran art in the Panjab in early Gupta period, but there is little doubt that the forces which stirred the nation to action in Madhya-deśa had their reverberations felt in the Panjab and Sindh. Even distant Afghanistan felt the effect of new stirrings in India, and Central Asia, that melting pot of Graeco-Roman, Indian and Chinese cultures readily responded to them.

The political and cultural activities of Chandragupta II drew their inevitable repercussions on the art of Madhyadeśa which gained a new spiritual meaning without sacrificing any of the artistic concepts. That the wide arm of Chandragupta had travelled as far as Sindh is proved by the mention of the seven mouths of Sindh in the Mehrauli Iron Pillar Inscription of Chandra. Therefore, a chain of *stūpas* in Sindh headed by the Mirpurkhas is no accident but gives additional support to the inscriptional claim of Chandragupta and Kālidāsa, the national poet, claiming the arms of the epic Raghu who probably stands for the personality of Chandragupta II, extending as far as Persia and the banks of the Oxus.

It is, however, not easy to establish an absolute chronology for the Sindh monuments. Looking at the early expansion and consolidation of Gupta power in Sindh, the Stūpa of Mirpurkhas and Jarak may be dated to the first half of the 5th century A.D., as the early Gupta influences are very marked in the style of decoration. The Stūpa of Thul Mir Rukan significantly enough was decorated with terracotta plaques depicting episodes from the life of the Buddha in the same manner as it was done in Gandhāra and Sarnath may be dated to *c.* 450 or later.

The stylistic analysis of the Sindh terracottas reveals a happy synthesis of Gandhāran and Guptan traditions. Certain Graeco-Indian motifs such as acanthus, frets, corinthian pilasters, masks, etc., combine happily with Gupta tradition of spirituality and restraint.

While dealing with the terracottas of Sindh, the stucco heads from Jaulian which reveal a new technique combing a frank naturalism with certain restraint have to be examined. The Gupta influence in Afghanistan is nowhere better illustrated than in the clay figures from Fondukistan. The figures from the point of view of modelling, standards of beauty, costumes and ornaments, are definitely the outcome of Gupta tradition penetrating and becoming acclimatised there. Hackin has rightly proposed post-Gupta dating for the Fondukistan figures.

While studying the terracotta art of the Stūpas of Sindh in Pakistan, Rangmahal in Bikaner, Rajasthan and Devnimori on one hand and certain decorative details in the temple decoration at Bhumara and Deograh, it is clear that the movement of art tradition was a double-sided one —the newly propounded Gupta tradition extending its influence from the central belt to western India, the Panjab and Sindh and while homecoming becoming enriched by the decorative devices prevalent there and which the Gupta temple builders employed in their own way.

While examining the mutual relationship between the terracotta figures and plaques from western India, the Panjab and beyond, and the Gupta temple art from the central belt, one has to take notice of the articles by Dr. Goetz entitled *Imperial Rome and the Genesis of Classical Indian Art*, published in two parts in the *East and West*, 1959. In the articles, Dr. Goetz has tried to prove his thesis that whatever good there is in Gupta, is borrowed from Greece, Rome and their colonies, and that the perverse nationalistic mentality of the Guptas consciously tried to hide the source of their borrowing. In order to prove the truth of his assertion he has produced a battery of far-fetched arguments. For instance, one could clinch his theory by asserting that in ancient world borrowing was never considered a sin and that the modern epithet with due acknowledgement, was unknown to unsophisticated ancient Indians as also to their contemporaries. As a matter of fact Kālidāsa who flourished in this Gupta period advises the giving up of old discarded views and the acceptance of new forms in art and literature without reserve from whatever source they came. One could be sure that if the "courtesy" theory existed in the Gupta period, the painters, architects and sculptors would have accepted it and made due acknowledgements even for the foreign influence which came to India several centuries earlier than the Guptas and had long lost their alien character and assimilated in the general run of Indian art."

Sri S. N. Chowdhary then read the following paper on "A Buddhist Stūpa and Vihāra at Devnimori":

"After three seasons' spade-work near a village called Devnimori about eighty miles northeast of Ahmedabad, a beautifully embellished *stūpa* and a *vihāra* have been excavated under the auspicies of the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, under the direction of Prof. B. Subbarao.

Actually it is a nucleus of Buddhist structures such as the *stūpa*, *vihāra*, an apsidal temple, small votive *stūpas* etc.

The *stūpa* is a solid lofty structure of burnt bricks and mud masonry, square at the base and tapering as it rises up. It has two square platforms one above the other and surmounted by an elongated hemispherical drum. The top *harmikā* and *chhatrayashṭi* are missing.

The lowest platform is 86′×86′ and rises 8′ from the ground level. It is decorated with pilasters 3′ in height. Those pilasters are surmounted by typical Indo-Corinthian capitals. The top corner of this platform is decorated with a horizontal frieze in relief. This frieze is composed of bands of chequer and acanthus leaves patterns arranged in a string-course.

The upper part of the second platform and the drum are heavily damaged. In spite of their dilapidated condition they do provide at least some clues to reconstruct their original shape and size.

The second platform is still intact up to the bases of the pilasters, i.e., up to about 4′–6″. The upper damaged drum was rounded in plan which is evident from the bonding of its core and outline which were laid in circular courses. These circular courses were traced up to 13′–6″ from the top. So it is clear that second platform must have been up to that height. The lower platform is 8′–0″. So if we subtract these two heights from the total height of 37′, it comes to about 16 to 17 feet. The height of the surmounting elongated hemispherical drum is to be conjuncted from the comparison of this *stūpa* with its genre such as those at Mirpurkhas, and Mir-rukhan from Sind. Architecturally, there are significant differences between the *stūpa* at Devnimori and those in Sind, in spite of the fact that a number of decorative motifs are common.

The second platform was decorated with a broad frieze of images of Buddha in *dhyānamudrā*, arches, medallions and other decorative motifs in floral and geometrical compositions. All these decorative terracottas were found collapsed on the top of platform no. 1.

The decorative scheme of the surmounting drum cannot be reconstructed properly, still we are justified in assuming that this drum was also decorated with some patterns in relief.

The *stūpa* is a typically late Gandhāran structure with two square platforms and elongated hemispherical drum. Its closest analogue, though later, is the *stūpa* at Mirpurkhas in Sind. The Mirpurkhas Stūpa has only one square platform and an exceptionally elongated drum, while Devnimori Stūpa has two square platforms and the drum. The decorative motifs of floral and geometrical compositions are almost the same. The chequer design, acanthus leaves compositions and wedge-shaped motifs are common, while some animal and human figures and some of the floral compositions at Mirpurkhas are absent here. They do not occur at Devnimori. The plan of the lower platform at Devnimori is plain—only a square base, while that of Mirpurkhas is a composite one. It has a shrine room on its western side. The niches of Mirpurkhas Stūpa are plain and decorated with chequer patterns only, while at Devnimori we have probably more elaborate niches. Probably each niche had a Buddha image in *dhyānamudrā* flanked by two pilasters and surmounted by *chaitya*-arches fretted with intricate designs.

But the main focus of attraction is the terracotta images of Buddha in *dhyānamudrā*. They are modelled perfectly having very good finish, unlike the images from Mirpurkhas they are devoid of haloes. The frills and folds of their drapery are depicted in typical incised and ribbed lines.

The haloes of the images of Mirpurkhas are decorated with floral motifs which correspond more or less to haloes of Buddha images of the Mathura school.

It is well known that during the last phase of Gandhāran school number and height of square platforms of *stūpas* increased. The surmounting hemispherical drum became more and more elongated like *stūpas* in Sind. The sides of these platforms and drums were studded with friezes of Buddha figures flanked by pilasters of Indo-Corinthian order. Modelling in clay was easy, so stone was replaced by clay.

From the numismatic evidence the earliest phase of the site can be dated to late third century to the end of fourth century A.D. The ceramic evidence of the Red Polished Ware pottery also supports this chronology. The last phase that is

Phase III is marked by Maitraka Coins of Shri Sarvabhaṭṭāraka (end of 5th century).

VIHĀRA

The *vihāra* is a simple square structure with an open central courtyard and thirty-one cells. It has a shrine room in its southern side and main entrance in its northern one. Its roof of flat tiles and other wooden accessories are completely missing. This *vihāra* has a drain in its southwestern corner.

It is clearly evident that this structure is also a late Gandhāran monastery.

The apsidal structure which was exposed near southwestern corner of the *stūpa* belongs to last phase of the site. Though it is heavily damaged its plan suggests that it is probably a prototype of the temple of Gupta age."

Dr. V. S. Agrawala stated that the texts tell us of three-terrace temples. Mirpurkhas is an example of a one-terrace temple; Devnimori is an example of a two-terrace temple.

Sri Krishna Deva informed the group that the earliest *stūpa*-temple at Nandangarh, dated to the 1st century B.C., is of the terraced type. This type continued not only in India, but spread to the countries of South East Asia, including Burma and Java (Borobudur). The earliest terraced temple of the Gupta period is the temple at Pawaya (Padamavati) of the 5th century. This has two terraces, with the third terrace carrying the shrine. This tradition continued in north India at Nalanda, Paharpur and Ahichchhātra. Terraced temples are also found at Abaneri and Mandor in Rajasthan. Thus the tradition of terraced temples continued from the 1st century B.C. to the 9th century.

Sri Pramod Chandra next read his paper on "Suggested Sequence of Gupta Styles in Western India," which is summarised below.

"The following sequence, in the order stated, is suggested for Gupta or sculpture of strongly Gupta derivation found from Bikaner in Rajasthan to Gujarat. This arrangement is based exclusively on stylistic considerations.

(1) Terracotta sculpture from Bikaner, now mostly in the Bikaner Museum.

(2) Mirpurkhas terracotta sculpture now mostly in the Prince of Wales Museum.

(3) Devni-mori terracotta sculpture, mostly in the Department of Archaeology, Baroda.

(4-1) Mirpurkhas bronzeBrahmā, in the Karachi Museum.

(4-b) Early group of stone sculptures from Samalaji, now in the Baroda Museum.

(4c) Early group of Akota bronzes, such as Jīvantasvāmī, Ṛishabhanātha, in the Baroda Museum

The gap between No. (1) and (2) is greater than between (3) and (4), which follow closely upon each other, the simultaneous existence of some not being ruled out. The time span for all the sculptures discussed should be between *c.* early 5th century and *c.* A.D. 550."

The paper was accompanied by 35 mm. slides.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray wondered about the comparison of cult objects, such as Buddha figures, in style and form with objects more narrative in character. As the two had different purposes, could they be compared? He also expressed caution about the comparison of terracotta with stone sculpture, as the two had their own technique. Ultimately the art form was determined by the material and the technique, and in the comparison of terracotta and stone one must always bear in mind that they are entirely different media. He further questioned whether in trying to build up a sequence we were not attempting to simplify matters too much. Certain regions may have had their own characteristics. Udayagiri rock-cut sculptures have a feeling of their own. Madhya-deśa had its social and economic organization, and that must have been different in Sind as well. Could this not account for differences in style? He only wished to utter a word of caution before scholars went to simplify the matter.

The discussion on Sri Pramod Chandra's paper was followed by Sri D. P. Ghosh's paper on "Extension of Gupta Art in South East Asia," which evoked no discussion. Shri D. P. Ghosh observed as follows:

"Gupta art in South East Asia is mainly an emanation of north Indian tradition.

Extension of Gupta art in South East Asia is conditioned by technique and thought of Gupta India. Sometimes monuments and sculptures are somewhat different in consequence of local additions and re-interpretation. Flowering of Indian art in South East Asia reflects a peculiar synthesis of various regional styles and periods of the main land. Expression of Gupta art beyond the seas is seldom pure and unmixed. Gupta art motifs and style recur on the main land. Buddhist sculptures are principal vehicles of Gupta heritage in South East Asia.

The earliest Gupta monuments and specially sculptures in South East Asia betray assimilation and integration of Andhra style of Amaravati school, followed by that of the Pallavas as shown in the figures of Harihara of Asram Maha Rosei of Cambodia, Sempaga Buddha of West Celebes, Palembang Buddha of Sumatra, etc.

The Gupta remains in old Prome, Burma; Anuradhapura, Ceylon; Ayudhya and Dvaravati schools of Siam and Gupta sculptures from Ligor, Takuapa and Caiya in Malay Peninsula show how the Gupta influence had travelled beyond the seas.

Pre-Khmer art of Funan in Cambodia (6th-7th century A.D.) is almost purely Gupta in character. The Buddha images of Prei-Krabas, Vat Romlok, Son-tho and female torso from Sambor Prei Kuk show definite Gupta lineage. Affinity between brick temples of Sambor and Sirpur, Gupta elements in the art of Champa are self-evident.

Earliest Śrīvijaya images of Buddha and Bodhisattva from Sumatra betray Gupta derivation as also the Palembang bronzes.

There is a paucity of Gupta sculptural remains in West Java. A panel in Djakarta Museum (*c.* 5th-6th century A.D.) is obviously the earliest Gupta piece in South East Asia. Relationship between Chandi Bima of Dieng Plateau and its Indian prototype is obvious. Sarnath and Ajanta schools exercised their influence on the Buddhas of Borobudur, Chandi Sewu, Chandi Mendut and the bronzes of Central Java. Predominantly Gupta idiom of Borobudur reliefs continued in Prambanan panels of the 9th century.

Standing Buddha of a Kota Bangun, Borneo is a masterpiece of Gupta Art."

Sri D. P. Ghosh's paper was followed by a talk by Sri S. K. Saraswati on "Development of the Medieval Schools of Sculpture and Architecture and Gupta Art." He observed as follows:

"Early Indian sculpture reaches its apogee in the Gupta classical idiom with its two outstanding centres of production at Sarnath and Mathura. The influence of this idiom extended far beyond the confines of the empire held by the Guptas in practically every direction in India as well as outside. The Gupta classical ideal survived the Gupta political power and in the medieval phase ultimately led to the development of a number of regional schools of sculpture in different parts of India.

In the history of Indian temple architecture the Gupta temples crystallised in the subsequent phase into the canonical temple styles, like the *Nāgara*, *Drāviḍa* and *Besara*."

The paper traced in outline the development of the medieval schools of sculpture and temple styles in the background of the Gupta achievements in the respective fields.

Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, remembering the wooden beginnings of Indian architecture, asked to what extent early architecture was brick- or stone-built. Was brick or stone construction possible in very early times? When the temple *śikhara* was raised, certain geometrical and algebraic problems were involved (unless the *śikhara* was filled with rubbish). The mathematical science which would help architects to work out details had not developed before the 4th century A.D. "The development of our architecture depends on constructional methods and material. When building in wood, a pliable material, the problem is simple, but when employing brick or stone, the measurements depend on atomizations of weights and units. Could we prove from other sources that we had that prerequisite knowledge of algebra and geometry before the 6th century A.D. to tackle architectural and construction problems?"

Dr. J. N. Banerjea supported Sri Saraswati's observations on the existence of temples before the Gupta period, which we know on epigraphical evidence. He referred to the two well-known pre-Christian inscriptions from Besnagar and at Nagari. "There must have been stone temples in the 1st quarter of the 1st century A.D. An inscription at Mathura refers to "stone temple," "railing" and "gateway." The inscription in the temple at Nagarjunikonda is of the 3rd century A.D."

Dr. V. S. Agrawala was of the opinion that the earlier material about temples has not been sufficiently studied. "The small platform depicted in Mathura sculpture is the *pūjāśila*. This was open to the sky, and is the earliest architectural form of the *sthāna* or *mahāsthāna*. At Bharhut and Sanchi, this simple idea is elaborated by means of railings, and the *stūpa* is on the central platform. The second type comes from Mathura of the Kushāṇa period several of which are square in plan. A square *chhatra* made of three stones created a small shrine for an image of the Buddha or the Bodhisattva. The example of the third type is the temple at Mukundara which is a small *maṇḍapa* on four pillars and flat roof, 7ft. × 7ft. The roof consists of at least three stones. At a later stage, features of all these three types co-exist in one. These are the architectural elements which go to make up the later temple."

Dr. J. N. Banerjea suggested that numismatic evidence could be sited in support of roofless shrines.

Dr. V. S. Agrawala spoke of a Mathura railing pillar showing the Buddha inside a shrine, which on its top had a kind of *śikhara*. He explained the atymology of the term *Besara: dvi+asra=dvayasra=besara* and also discussed the origin of the term *nāgara* (of the north), which is the northern style. He suggested that we must explore more seriously additional material to study the origin of *nāgara* and *besara* style.

Sri M. N. Deshpande suggested that the temple at Ter is neglected. It is a brick temple, of Gupta plan, renovated in about the 6th century, employing corbelling. The original temple belongs to about the 3rd century.

Dr. V. S. Agrawala made a special appeal to the Director General of Archaeology for the systematic survey of Gupta monuments, which Sri A. Ghosh assured, had already been undertaken.

Sri Saraswati's paper was followed by the paper of Sri Krishna Deva, on "Extensions of Gupta Art," (for full text see Appendix 'B'). There was no discussion. He observed as follows:

"Art critics have not been quite fair in adjudging the merits of the post-Gupta art. The art of 7th-8th century neither marked the desiccation of the creative genius nor did it simply feast on the remnants of bygone Classical age. Apart from the supreme sculptural achievements of Ellora and Elephanta, these centuries were marked by abundant cultural activity in all parts of the country. The creative record of the age is illustrated by an outburst of Kaliṅga art under the Bhauma-karas, of the art of Gujarat and Saurashtra under the Maitrakas and the art of Madhya-deśa under the Pushpabhūtis and Pratīhāras, as exemplified by the specimens of sculptures found at sites like Kanauj, Abaneri, Osian, Gwalior and Pathari.

Of Indian architecture only foundations were laid in the Gupta period. Morphologically and conceptually the Gupta temple with a simple plan comprising a cella and porch having low roofs and squat pillars was essentially derived from the rock-cut prototype and had just outgrown the rock-cut stage. The structural temple emerged triumphant in the post-Gupta age when the temple plan and design received significant elaborations with definite basement mouldings, tall pillars of well-defined order, a wall with a set scheme of decorative and plastic ornaments and a roof with an aspiration for height. After numerous experiments which were carried on during the Gupta age with the temple roof-design, the curvilinear *śikhara* was accepted as the most satisfactory during this period. Of course flat-roofed shrines and *śikhara*-shrines of various types continued to be built in this age. Among the aberrant types may be mentioned the Muṇḍeśvarī temple which is an octagonal structure on a circular plan with eight projections *(ashṭa-bhadravṛitta-samsthānaka)* and the temples with wagon-vault *(śālā-śikhara)* roof illustrated by the Teli-ka-Mandir at Gwalior, Vaitāl Deul at Bhubaneswar and Navadevī shrine at Yageswar, District Almora.

One of the most characteristic features of Indian art is the harmonious integration of sculpture with architecture. In the Gupta period sculpture had its existence apart from architecture and in fact dominates over the latter. It is since the Pratīhāra age that sculpture becomes architectonic and merges with architecture. The *parivāra-devatās* are now invariably carved in the niches of the central projections *(bhadras)*, which are crowned by pediments of *chaitya*-arches *(udgamas)*, The *ashṭa-dikpālas* or the eight guardians of the quarters are regularly introduced on the corner projections of the shrine facades which are also adorned with other well-defined plastic and decorative ornaments.

It is thus seen that the Gupta temple marks the infancy of Indian architecture, while its adolescence is reached only in the Pratīhāra age. The characteristic plan and design of the Indian temple crystallises only in this period which also witnessed the emergence of the curvilinear roof *(rekhā-śikhara)*, forming the most typical trait or cognizance of the northern temple style.

This age was also remarkable for the growth of Āgama literature and Hindu mythology which are reflected in the enormous development of iconography. The concepts of various *anugraha* and *samhāra-mūrtis* of Śiva including Ardhanārīśvara, Aja Ekapāda and Liṅgodbhava forms, of Maheśamūrti and Lakuliśa, Sapta-mātṛikās, Vishṇu as Vaikuṇṭha and Viśvarūpa and Kṛishṇa-līlā scenes were elaborated during this age. The same is also true of the Buddhist pantheon and relative iconography which showed a phenomenal development."

PROCEEDINGS ON THE THIRD DAY

Dr. Moti Chandra, moderator of the third day's session on "Pre-Mughal Painting of the Sultanate Period (excluding Western Indian Style)," gave a general introduction to the subject, new to many participants. Only a few years ago, he said, it was generally believed that the Western Indian school of painting was the only style in existence in the period roughly between 1350 to 1550. It had as its locale Rajasthan and Gujarat, though the style extended to Jaunpur and Mandu. "The Western Indian style has three major characteristics— (a) angularity of draughtsmanship; (b) contortion of the body; and (c) protruberance of the further eye. Landscape is reduced to the minimum, and only a few figures make up the composition. Simple colours are used.

For some time bitter controversy raged over the origin of Rajasthani painting. One view holds that Rajasthani painting owes its origin to the Mughals, while a second view contends that its inspiration lay in a pre-Mughal school. The latter view found support from illustrated Mss. in an entirely different style which show different costumes, new approach to composition and the figure drawing which though retaining certain Western Indian features eschews the use of the further eye. For convenience sake this style is called the *Chaurapañchāśikā* style—the nomenclature being derived from a group of paintings with certain characteristic features which it shares with similar paintings discovered later on.

One critic, Karl Khandalavala, relied heavily on a particular item of costume, namely the *chākdār jāmā*, which is a characteristic feature of the male costume in Akbar period, in late dating the school. Did the *chākdār jāmā* exist in pre-Mughal times? This query will have to be answered before the group of paintings in which this particular item of costume appears is dated to pre-Akbar period.

In the *Laur Chandā-Chaurapañchāśikā* group, several illustrated Mss. have been discovered, including the Prince of Wales Museum *Gīta Govinda*, the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, and the *Laur Chandā* illustrations in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, and in the Lahore and Chandigarh Museums, a profusely illustrated copy in a library in Manchester and sixty-eight leaves in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. The problem before us is, where did this style originate? Malwa? Gujarat? Rajasthan? U.P.? It was surmised that it originated in eastern U.P. Though the evidence in support of this was slow in coming, the new Mss. did bear a slight resemblance to the Jaunpur *Kalpasūtra* of 1465 and the *Mahāpurāṇa* dated 1540 in the first regnal year of Sher Shāh and painted at Palam, a suburb of Delhi. All this showed there was a flourishing school in U.P. with its own idiom of expression. In future, no doubt more and more dated Mss. in this style would be forthcoming, which would enable us to clear up the gap between the Western Indian style and the Mughal school, opening up an entirely new chapter in the history of Indian art."

Next A. K. Bhattacharyya read his paper on "Painting of the Sultanate Period." He observed:

"The number of paintings available during the Sultanate period is naturally very small. The *Nim'at-nāmah* belonging to the period of Nasīr Shāh Khaljī has a few illustrations which show some characteristics revealing Indian influence and, therefore, may be taken to have originated in India, in early 16th century. The copy of *Būstān* of Sa'dī in the National Museum has paintings of the Herati School of Persian miniature art which shows no particular Indian features. The text in the roundel of fol. 1 of this Ms. also does not clearly prove that it was executed in Malwa in India. The date of endorsement is also no proof in that respect and the style of writing is a definite negation of that theory. The only paintings definitely ascribable to the Sultanate period probably relate to the illustrations in a manuscript of Amīr Khusrau's *Khamsah* preserved in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington. These show some of the Indian features of an earlier period. A stray painting of Laur Chandā in the National Museum shows certain early features noticeable in earlier Gujarati paintings from the west. These were continued in the Malwa school of painting where the archaic features were retained in the paintings datable between 1550 and 1630 A.D. The common features running through them relate to broad architectural patterns, dresses of women, style of the cushion, the manner of sitting, the pattern of flowing *oḍhnī*, etc. The *Laur Chandā* paintings and those of its kind may probably, therefore, be put also in the Sultanate period with origin in eastern Gujarat or western Malwa, and roughly dated in the later half of the 15th century or early 16th century."

The paper was accompanied by lantern slides.

Sri Bhattacharyya's paper was followed by that of Dr. Anand Krishna entitled "Paintings in the Sultanate Period." He observed:

"The cultural renaissance during the Sultanate period (1206-1526 A.D.) in our country has never been fully studied and explained. Great patrons of art, literature, music, architecture and possibly painting flourished during this period. The Sultanate period corresponded to a great period of artistic activity in Persia, China and other centres of civilization in Asia, and India does not seem to have been an exception.

Both in the Muslim courts at Delhi and other provincial centres as well as in the local Hindu courts, the art of painting seems to have been immensely popular. The contemporary Hindi poetry is full of such references, which leaves no doubt that painting had a recognised place in society.

Abul Fadl pays a high tribute to the pre-Akbar painting which certainly could not aim at decadent Western Indian style; it clearly suggests that there had been a revival of Indian painting in this period. A large section of the Akbari painters seem to have been drawn from such traditional centres, and therefore, survivals of their traditional style is obviously present in the early Akbari illustrations.

The Apabhraṁśa or Western Indian painting represents a popular version of the Sultanate school. It is noteworthy that at the cultural centres like Mewar, Mandu, Jaunpur, Ahmedabad etc., the Apabhraṁśa illustrations showed much higher quality of workmanship. Possibly Delhi was another such centre as a Rajasthani version of the Sultanate style is known from a 1540 A.D. Ms. of the *Mahāpurāṇa* painted at Palam (Delhi).

The Sultanate style made an impression on the Apabhraṁśa style, as is known from the marginal illustrations of an undated Ms. (*circa* 1475 A.D.) at the Devshā nā Pāḍā Jñāna Bhaṇḍār. The same process seems to have been operative in the treatment of Sāhī figures and other motifs in the *Kālaka Kathā* illustrations of fairly early date.

Several illustrated Mss. and stray paintings formerly attributed to Persian style have been now clearly proved to have belonged to the Indian style of the Sultanate period. A newly discovered and unpublished illustrated Ms. of this type belongs to the Gujarat court. So far no example from Gujarat was known, although the Devshā nā Pāḍā Ms. was considered to have been influenced by the Sultanate style at the Ahmedabad court.

The Mṛigāvatī paintings in Bhārat Kalā Bhavan show the popular version of the Sultanate style. It presents a variety of subjects and methods of treatment. It also forms a valuable document shedding important light on the cultural life of the period and one of the earliest documents supporting the view that the origin of Rajasthanī painting could be assigned to the pre-Akbar period. On stylistic analysis, it can be dated at *c.* 1550 A.D."

The paper was accompanied by lantern slides.

Following Dr. Anand Krishna's paper Sri Pramod Chandra presented his paper entitled "Two New Documents of Pre-Mughal Painting." Due to a shortage of time there was no discussion on any of the papers on painting.

Sri Pramod Chandra observed:

"During the last several years, a number of paintings have been discovered which demonstrate that alongside the Western Indian school there developed other styles which have contributed a great deal towards the development of the well known Mughal and Rajasthani schools of the late 16th and 17th centuries. One aspect of this style is represented by the changes to be observed in some Mss. of the Western Indian style. Generally conservative, it nevertheless shows new trends in Mandu and Jaunpur and to a certain extent Devshā nā Pāḍā *Kalpasūtras*, and as such, stand apart from the general run. The Ms. of the *Kālakāchāryakathā* presented here is the newest discovery of this type of Ms., and perhaps the most beautiful. Though much more varied and pleasing, it is very similar to the Mandu *Kalpasūtra* of 1439, and must be dated to the same place and period.

In addition to the above group of unique Western Indian Mss., we find a more Persianised style, with comparatively pale colouring and probably done at the Sultanate courts. Of these, the best known are the *Nim'at Nāmah* of the India Office Library and the *Laur-Chandā* of the Prince of Wales Museum, both datable to the first half of the 16th century A.D. The illustrated Ms. of *Laur-Chandā* in the Manchester Library presented here is yet another Ms. It follows in this style closely the Prince of Wales Museum *Laur-Chandā* and shows several elements that are common to the *kulāhdār* group of pictures and early Rajasthani painting, in composition and draughtsmanship, if not in colour."

The paper was accompanied by 35 mm. slides.

At the end of the seminar, Dr. Moti Chandra thanked everybody who made the seminar a success. He also thanked Dr. Anand Krishna for making excellent arrangements and the authorities of the Hindu University and the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan without whose co-operation it would have been very difficult to hold the seminar at Banaras.

Appendix A

SOME PROBLEMS OF ART AND ICONOGRAPHY DURING THE AGE OF THE KUSHĀṆAS AND THE SĀTAVĀHANAS

J. N. Banerjea

INDIAN art from the last part of the first century B.C. to the end of the third century A.D. or a little later can be placed under two broad geographical divisions, the first localised in northern India under the Śaka-Pahlava and the Kushāṇa hegemony, and the second in the Deccan under the Sātavāhana and the Kshatrapa rule. The earlier time-limit of this phase or phases of Indian art is fixed in this way on account of the fact that the Śaka-Pahlava rule over parts of northern India was established at about that time, and the Sātavāhana domination over parts of southern India seems to have commenced some time near that period. It is true that the extant remains belonging to this anterior limit are very few and far between, and mostly consist of terracotta objects, coins, lapidaries' work and a few structural finds. The later limit is drawn up to the end of the third century A.D., or some time later, for it was near about that time that the Kushāṇa ascendancy over a large part of northern India, and the more or less corresponding Sātavāhana overlordship in the south were overthrown. It was the patronage of the kings of these two principal royal dynasties, which was mainly behind the development in the styles of sculptural, architectural and other arts of India. It is not, however, correct to say that the activities of the artists and craftsmen ceased in the country after the disappearance of these paramount lines of kings, for those of the Madhyadeśa and Dakshiṇāpatha began to ply their art with greater vigour and precision under the patronage of the Guptas, Ikshvākus and other dynasties.

Indian art of the period under consideration confined roughly to the limits of the northwestern and northern parts of the country can again be broadly divided into two regional groups, the one flourishing in ancient Gandhāra and its environs, and the other localised mainly in the district of Mathura and the adjoining regions. The evidence of a donative inscription on one of the architraves of the southern gateway of Sanchi (the earliest of the four *toraṇas*) recording that it was the gift of a certain Ānanda, foreman of the artisans of Śatakarṇī (most probably the son of Simuka) does not prove clearly its affiliation to the art of the Sātavāhana order. Early Buddhist art as manifested in the *vedikā* and *toraṇas* of Sanchi, though partially falling within the earlier limit of our period does not come under the same category as the art of Gandhāra and Mathura from the point of view of tradition, technique and convention. The art of India during the Sātavāhana period was mainly associated with western Deccan, its offshoots spreading to the eastern parts of the Deccan—the Āndhradeśa proper, where it was soon to floresce during the period of the later Sātavāhanas and the Ikshvākus.

It is needless to emphasise that all these phases of Indian art, specially in their major branches of sculpture and architecture, were mainly religious in character, and the religion best and most served by the artists of the extreme north and northwest was Mahāyāna Buddhism. Brāhmaṇism and Jainism, as well as the folk religions like the worship of the

Yakshas and the Nāgas, did also engage the services of the artists of the period, but it was mainly the Madhyadeśa region of Mathura and several other places nearby where clear evidence of this nature is available. The services of various kinds of artists and craftsmen, such as architects, sculptors, metal-casters, potters and others were requisitioned by the pious people affiliated to various religions current at that time. These *śilpins* kept themselves busy in the making of divine images and emblems, the construction of shrines or the *devagṛihas* for housing them properly, the erection of funerary monuments (*stūpas* with their various components), building of *vihāras* or monasteries for the residence of the monks, the carving of reliquaries, terracotta and many other objects more or less intimately associated with ritual worship. But it is also true that in some places in the extreme north and northwest of India, as well as in parts of the Deccan, have been found in course of excavations numerous remains of minor art in the form of jewellery, iron and stone objects, terracotta and stone figurines, bronze and terracotta seals, coins in different metals, etc., about the avowedly secular character of which there cannot be any doubt.

In studying the different art objects of the extreme north and northwest, the early phase of which is mostly designated by art critics as Gandhāra art, some of the problems that confront us are the following:

What were the principal elements, racial, geographical and cultural in character, that contributed to its growth and development? There cannot be any doubt about the subject-matter of a good majority of them of avowedly religious nature having been Indian. This was mainly connected with Mahāyāna Buddhism, and images of Buddha, stories associated with his last and previous births (the latter being comparatively few), a few Bodhisattvas etc. were the themes that were utilised by the artists. In analysing these art forms critically one can no doubt recognise some Indian traits, but there are found in them many features that are alien to India. The problem that confronted historians of Gandhāra art as a whole was to designate it correctly keeping in mind its composite character. Grünwedel and Burgess discussed the appropriateness of such names as Graeco-Buddhist, Arian, Indo-Greek and Indo-Bactrian, etc., in this connection, but were reluctant to use any of them for fear of giving an inaccurate account about its art origin. They chose the topographical designation as the most apposite and innocuous, though they pointed out that a major section of it manifested western or classical influence. They recognised early that a good many of the borrowings were made from Greek, Roman and even Christian elements. They cited several cases of such borrowals, one of which from Greek or rather Hellenistic art was the theme of Garuḍa lifting a Nāga maiden or a Nāga couple by its beak frequently to be found in Gandhāran art. This was rightly adjudged by them as the local adaptation if the famous sculpture 'Rape of Ganymede' by the Hellenistic artist Leochares. Marshall afterwards in his various excavation reports and specially in his volumes on *Taxila* (1951) described this element as mainly Hellenistic, though he gave also due weight to the presence of Roman features in it. In the light of his discoveries at Taxila he was definite about the Graeco-Roman element being present in almost every class of antiquity unearthed at Taxila, and this influence he would associate to a great measure 'with the Hellenising tendencies of the Parthian conquerors while they were established there in the first century A.D.' Buchthall, however, in his lecture on 'The Western Aspects of Gandhāra Sculpture' (Hartz Trust

Annual Lecture on Art, British Academy, 1945) was of the opinion that the foreign element in this art was definitely Roman in character. After carefully comparing various Roman and Gandhāran art forms and noting their similarities, he concluded that the latter was derived from the former.

In tackling this problem the age of the best period of Gandhāran art should be taken into consideration. It is the unanimous opinion of scholars that its florescence took place during the period of the imperial Kushāṇas, its beginnings being traceable not to the period of the Bactrian Greek rule in India but to the age of the Scytho-Parthian domination over parts of northern and northwestern India. The contact of the early Kushāṇa kings and emperors from the time of Kujula Kadphises—Kadaphes to that of the Kanishka group of kings with the contemporary Roman world can be demonstrated with the help of their coins, and also some available literary data. It is thus presumable that the main foreign element in the composite art of northwestern India was Roman in character. But the use of the term "Hellenistic" in designating it may also be partly justified, for was not the Roman art of the times itself influenced by Hellenistic art trends? In this way the problem of naming the chief alien element in the composite art of Gandhāra may be solved.

The other branch of the Śaka-Kushāṇa art of Mathura and the adjoining regions does not raise any real problem of this nature, for there is no controversy regarding its basic Indian character. The Mathura art under the Kushāṇas or for the matter of that under the earlier Śaka Mahākshatrapas was an outgrowth of the ancient Indian schools. Some inscriptions of the time of the Śaka Mahākshatrapa Shoḍāśa refer to the stone temples and the images of a few Brāhmaṇical deities, the ruins of which were found in Mathura and its environs. But here also its best period coincides with the great century of the Kushāṇa rule under Kanishka I and his successors. Over and above the numerous motifs connected with Mahāyāna Buddhism, the local remains associated with Brāhmaṇical and folk religions as well as Jainism distinctly show their basically Indian features. Some supposed alien elements in the Mathura school of sculpture are undoubtedly of an adventitious character, such as those manifest in the so-called 'Bacchanalian scenes,' 'Herakles and the Nemean Lion,' etc. There is, however, some doubt whether they have been correctly designated; some of these reliefs illustrating such exotic themes might depict the exploits of the jovial and pleasure-loving Yādavas, the descriptions of which are given in parts of the epic and purāṇic literature.

The real problem about many of the Gandhāran art forms, and to a much lesser extent about the Mathura ones, however, is connected with their exact dating. Their chronological sequence may be determined with some amount of accuracy on the basis of stylistic traits, but the bigger problem regarding their beginning and duration cannot be said to have been satisfactorily solved as yet. Opinions still differ about the exact date of the Bimaran relic casket, and scholars are not agreed even now about the time of the rule (about twenty-three years) of the great Kanishka. Controversies on this point and various other points of chronology still exist, and a satisfactory and unanimously accepted solution of this difficult problem is a desideratum.

There is no real problem now regarding the origin of the Buddha image, which can undoubtedly be traced to the Śaka-Kushāṇa period. The aniconic tradition in the worship of the deified Buddha is manifest in the early Buddhist art of central, western and eastern India, but it was replaced by the cult of the human image of Buddha at about this time. Most, if not all indologists, hold the view that the iconisation of Buddha took place nearly simultaneously in Gandhāra and Mathura. The local artists of Mathura undoubtedly modelled the principal features of the Buddha images on those of the figures of Yakshas and Nāgas. It was suggested first by Grünwedel, and by Foucher after him, that 'the Hellenistic Buddha of Gandhāra was originally based on the Apollo model, and with the gradual idealisation of the type it came to be more and more Indianised.' But a consideration of some of the finest Buddha figures in the Peshawar and Lahore Museums, both standing and seated, leaves little doubt that some iconographic elements, basically Indian, can be traced in them. Yet it may even now be questioned whether the basic problem about the *raison de etre* for this iconisation has been satisfactorily solved. It is a fact that a century or so before the earliest appearance of the Buddha image in art, the Master was being represented by means of aniconic symbols in Buddhist monuments. What were the significant changes in the religious outlook of the Buddhists, that were at the root of this innovation? Foucher tried to solve the problem by suggesting that the Indians were not accustomed to making divine images for worship, and so Buddha images were not made and worshipped at first after his deification. It was the Hellenistic sculptors of Gandhāra, who according to him were the first iconographers of Buddha. It was also his indirect suggestion that the images of gods and goddesses belonging to other higher religions of India came to be made and worshipped after the introduction of the 'Buddha image cult'.

But the subsequent researches of scholars do not justify these conclusions.

It is, thus, still a problem to account for satisfactorily the causes behind the sudden and almost simultaneous appearance of the human image of Buddha in Gandhāra and Mathura. O. C. Gangoly in his very illuminating article on 'The Antiquity of the Buddha Image — The Cult of the Buddha' (*Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, Neue Folge XIV, Heft 2/3, pp. 41-59) tried to solve it with the help of a passage in the *Bambhajāla Sutta* (*Dīgha Nikāya*, 1, 73) and other early and late texts, as well as some apposite illustrations; but it may be that the last word has yet to be said about the solution of the problem. Still his observations on this topic are far more acceptable than Buchthall's confident assertion that the idea about the worship of the human image of Buddha was derived from the worship of the Roman emperors. The indigenous Indian tradition of the *Mahāpurushalakshaṇas* idealised and depicted in the figure of the deified Buddha is found in some early Pāli texts of the pre-Christian period, and a few of the *lakshaṇas* which could be given plastic form were represented with greater or lesser skill by the sculptors of Mathura and Gandhāra. It may incidentally be observed in this connection that modern art historians are still reluctant to understand the real significance of such *lakshaṇas* as *ushṇīshaśiraskatā*, etc., though they are clearly and competently explained by such comparatively early writers like Buddhaghosha. They would still render the term as 'cranial protuberance,' when there is no doubt that what is found on the top of the early Buddha figures is nothing but the plastic form of 'the tied hair knot.' This 'sign', according to the great Pāli writer, indicated nothing but 'a full fleshy forehead' and 'the umbrella-shaped top of the head' (J. N. Banerjea on 'Ushṇīshaśiraskatā — a Mahāpurushalakshaṇa' in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 1931).

Another problem connected with the artistic remains of Gandhāra and Mathura appears to me to be the extreme paucity or virtual absence of the images of any Brāhmaṇical deities among them. The coins of the imperial Kushāṇas show that the images of such Brāhmaṇical deities as Śiva, Umā, Mahāsena (Skanda-Kumāra-Viśākhā) were known at the time, for their figures were used as devices on them. But it is somewhat strange that when so many images of the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas have been discovered in Gandhāra and Mathura (comparatively few Bodhisattva images have been found at the latter place), practically no images of the other group have been discovered. The figures of Śiva on the coins of Kanishka, Huvishka and Vāsudeva show a great development in the iconography of the god at the time. This fact presupposes the regular and frequent use of such images for ritual worship by the votaries of the god. Shall we explain the lacuna by suggesting that these images were mostly made of impermanent materials like wood or clay, and this is the reason why they have not been found? But if this was so, then why this distinction between Buddhist and Brāhmaṇical images? Another interesting fact may be noted in this context. Some copper coins of Ujjain belonging to the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era unmistakably prove that Śiva was worshipped in his theriomorphic, human and phallic forms simultaneously. The coins of Wema Kadphises and his successors show that the first two forms were continued to be worshipped; but, if the third (phallic) form was also in use, this is not indicated by the coins. Yet there is no doubt that phallicism was known to the Kushāṇa die-cutters. A unique gold coin of Huvishka in the collection of the British Museum bears on its reverse side the device of a composite god (probably a combined representation of Hari-Hara) who is ithyphallic *(ūrdhvaliṅga)*.

It has already been said that art in Gandhāra and Mathura belonging to the early centuries of the Christian era was pre-eminently religious in character. Remnants of stone sanctuaries, *stūpas*, monasteries, etc., have been found there in some number; but remains of secular architecture in durable materials like stone are almost conspicuous by their absence. But statues of some Kushāṇa kings like Wema Kadphises and Kanishka, and probably one of Mahā Kshatrapa Chashṭaṇa were found in Mathura. They were contemporary ones, but were they fully secular? The coins of the Kushāṇa emperors definitely show the aura of divinity attaching to them, and these imperial statues were meant perhaps for ritual worship in structures constructed for housing them. Discovery of remains of secular architecture in stone would have helped us to gain perhaps more comprehensive knowledge than what we get from the extant brick and mud secular buildings of the period.

The observations about the problems of art and iconography during the Śaka-Kushāṇa hegemony in north India can, with some modification, be made with regard to the Deccanese art during the Sātavāhana overlordship. The rock-cut cave architecture of western Deccan, however, confronts us with a phenomenon which is absent in the contemporary art of north India. The hard-grained rock of Sahyādri and its spurs in the western Deccan served as the field of work of the local artists who plied their chisels for building the secluded and restful places of meditation and worship of the Buddhist monks belonging to the different orders of the Bhadavāniyas, Trairaśmikas, and others. These solitary spots of scenic beauty were ideal for rest and religious meditation, and it is no wonder that the Sātavāhanas and other ruling chiefs or magnates of this region, and some even from an earlier period would cause these structures to be built and dedicated for such use. It is the unanimous opinion of scholars that one of the earliest of them was Bhaja cave which has been dated by them in the second century B.C. According to the usually accepted Sātavāhana chronology Bhaja would fall outside the period of the rise of this dynasty; but the structural technique followed in this earlier monument was to a great extent adopted and developed in similar monuments of Karle, Nasik, Kanheri, etc. of a later period falling under the age of the Sātavāhanas and the Western Kshatrapas. These massive architectural remains of the region are objects of wonder to the historians of Indian art. It is, however, still a problem, how the architects and sculptors of the locality, who were presumably accustomed for generations to the technique and art of wood-carving could ply with so much skill, accuracy and artistry the stone-mason's chisel on these rock traps. There is no direct evidence anywhere in these monuments that the services of foreign artists were requisitioned for their construction. The names of some aliens, some of whom bore Indian names were found engraved in several of these caves; thus, Irila (perhaps he was a Goth) caused to be built two cisterns for the use of the monks at Junnar, Chita building a meeting-hall at the same place, Indrāgnidata excavating a cave at Nāsik, and Dhenukākaṭa constructing a temple at Karle. But they were presumably donors of these benefactions, and were not the actual builders.

Problems also exist as regards the exact dating of the individual *chaitya*-halls. The most interesting and extensive structure at Karle can be taken as one important unit which may throw some light on it. The Bhaja, Kondane and Pitalkhora group of cave *chaitya*-halls are stylistically much earlier than Karle, probably about one century and a half. The beginnings of the Nasik-Nahapāna cave (No. 10 there) and the Kanheri cave have been approximately dated by some — the first within a few years after the completion of Karle, and the second within about a century after that. Then the question remains about the period of construction of the Karle cave itself. This magnificent and elaborate *chaitya*-hall must have taken several decades for taking its final shape. This aspect of the problem was not taken into consideration by most of the scholars who discussed it previously. A very elaborate editorial article appearing in *Lalit Kalā* (Nos. 3-4, pp. 11-26) tackles this problem with great skill and acumen. It has been shown there that the construction of the Karle *chaitya* extended over the period from *circa* 40 A.D. to 100 A.D. Thus the dating of the other two groups of caves can be tentatively settled on the basis of this major conclusion. The epigraphic data found in the caves themselves, especially that in Kanheri, also throw much light on this problem. But doubts may still be raised about the period of the Nahapāna cave in relation to that of Karle. The pillar capitals in the former show features which appear to be stylistically earlier than the far more developed ones of the latter.

Appendix B

EXTENSIONS OF GUPTA ART: ART AND ARCHITECTURE OF THE PRATĪHĀRA AGE

Krishna Deva

OF Indian architecture only foundations were laid in the Gupta period. Morphologically and conceptually the Gupta temple with a simple plan comprising a cella and porch having low roofs and squat pillars was essentially derived from the rock-cut prototype and had just outgrown the rock-cut stage. The structural temple emerged triumphant in the post-Gupta age when the temple plan and design received significant elaborations with definite basement mouldings, tall pillars of well-defined order, a wall with a set scheme of decorative and plastic ornaments and a roof with an aspiration for height. After numerous experiments which were carried on during the Gupta age with the temple roof-design, the curvilinear *śikhara* was accepted as the most satisfactory during this period. Of course, flat-roofed shrines and *śikhara*-shrines of various types continued to be built in this age.

In fact the post-Gupta period appears to have been an age of experimentation in north India. During the seventh-eighth centuries various temple forms were tried and we find a fair number with a flat roof, some with a straight pyramidal roof, others with an undeveloped curvilinear *śikhara*, and a few with a roof of receding horizontal tiers. Small flat-roofed shrines comprising a *tri-ratha* sanctum and a *prāggrīva* or portico with two pillars in front are found in large numbers in central India, continuing the traditions of the early Gupta temple form. These are unpretentious temples with simple *adhishṭhāna* mouldings, a *jaṅghā* of large slabs, and a flat monolithic slab-roof each for the sanctum and the portico, the latter being slightly lower. Most of them are smaller than the earliest Gupta temples of Sanchi and Tigawa and are generally simpler in construction, though they have more ornate doorway and pillars, and display sculptured niches crowned by an *udgama* on each of the three *bhadra*-projections. The pillars of the porch are decorated with *ghaṭa-pallava* design at the base, a *padma-bandha* carved with lotuses and *kīrttimukhas* and a *ghaṭa-pallava* capital, surmounted by brackets either of plain curved profile or embellished with the early Pratīhāra foliage, representing a quarter lotus.

A variant of this type also occurs displaying a decoration of only pilasters on the *jaṅghā*. The most ornate example of this variety is the Śiva temple at Mahua, District Shivapuri, which combines the decor of pilasters with sculptured niches on the *bhadra*-projections. This temple is also notable for bearing an inscribed record assignable to *circa* seventh century.

Among the aberrant types may be mentioned the Muṇḍeśvarī temple in District Shahabad of Bihar which is an octagonal structure *(ashṭāśra)* with eight projections *(ashṭa-bhadra)*, the temple with wagon-vault *(śālā-śikhara)* roof illustrated by the Telī-kā-Mandir at Gwalior, Vaitāl Deul at Bhubaneswar and Navadevī shrine at Yageswar, District Almora, is also an uncommon type.

While these temples were being built in central and north India a brisk building activity was being pursued in a part of the Deccan with principal centres at the early Chāḷukyan sites of Aihole, Badami, Mahākūteśvara and Pattadakal, all situated in District Bijapur.

But more significant than these is the group of temples at

Alampur situated in District Mahabubnagar on the bank of the Tungabhadra. This place has nine temples popularly known as the Nava-Brahmā temples of which eight belong to the northern style and one (the Tarka-Brahmā) to the southern. The temples of the northern style, locally called the Viśva-Brahmā, Vīra-Brahmā, Arka-Brahmā, Kumāra-Brahmā, Bāla-Brahmā, Padma-Brahmā, Garuḍa-Brahmā and Svarga-Brahmā, mark the culmination of the Chāḷukyan architecture and are comparable to the early Pratīhāra temples of north India in essential features of plan, composition and ornaments. Their lay-out is more logical and organic than that of the Pāpanātha temple at Pattadakal over which they mark a distinct improvement. The odd hesitancy and the incongruities of the Pāpanātha temple illustrated by the *hāra* of *kūṭa*, *śālā* and *pañjara* of the southern order adorning the first floor parapet have now gone. The principal decoration of the *jaṅghā* composed of niches and latticed windows attains here a lyrical elegance and the modelling of sculptures is more sensitive and less weighty. The heavy mouldings of the *adhishṭhāna* and the ponderous *kapota* mouldings separating the *jaṅghā* from the *śikhara* of the Pāpanātha are subdued and become more architectonic and the *śikhara* is more proportionate and shows a better curvature, though it is still *tri-ratha* in design. These are *sāndhāra* temples with a distinctive interior arrangement. The *antarāla* forms an integral adjunct of the sanctum. In front of the *antarāla* is built the central pillared nave of the *maṇḍapa* with a higher roof resembling a clerestory resting on four to eight pillars and a pair of pilasters. The nave is surrounded by aisles with a sloping roof. A pillared portico has survived in front of the *maṇḍapa* only on two examples. Two doorways are usually provided in the interior, one for the sanctum and the other for the *maṇḍapa*. In most cases the doorway shows an extended overdoor design and the *lalāṭa-bimba* depicts Garuḍa holding the tail ends of adoring Nāgas forming a canopy over the heads of Gaṅgā and Yamunā appearing on the lower parts of the jambs. The *maṇḍapa* pillars carrying ornate brackets are usually decorated with the typical Pratīhāra foliage. The pillars, however, differ in details; the central *maṇḍapa* pillars of the Viśva-Brahmā temple show the Pallava type of sejant lion motif at the base. The sanctum proper is *tri-ratha* corresponding to the *tri-ratha* design of the *śikhara* and exhibits a sculptured niche on each *bhadra*-projection.

Thus in respect of general plan and design and many typical architectural and decorative motifs, such as ornamental square rafter-ends, composition of niches and the niche-shrines of the sanctum transepts and the garland loop pattern surmounting the *jaṅghā* these temples come close to the early Pratīhāra temples.

The Svarga-Brahmā is engraved with an inscription of Chāḷukyan Vijayāditya (A.D. 696-733) of the Badami family and the Kumāra-Brahmā mentions a Vallabha, the well-known *viruda* of the early Chāḷukyan kings, in characters of *circa* eighth century. These temples therefore appear to have been erected under the patronage of the early Chāḷukya rulers of Badami during the eighth century.

PRATĪHĀRA TEMPLES OF CENTRAL INDIA

The surviving temples of central India and Rajasthan dating from *circa* eighth and ninth centuries have certain common features, which distinguish them from the preceding and following building modes. As these regions were largely under the sway of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras during the eighth-ninth centuries, we may call this style Pratīhāra in the absence of a better term. The style, however, spread over vast tracts of north India, including the present states of Uttar Pradesh and the Punjab as far as the Himalayas and had its reverberations further east and west. It is but natural that a style so extensive as this should show regional variations and local idioms.

The Pratīhāra temples of central India are characterized by a low *adhishṭhāna*, a simple and relatively stunted *śikhara*, a *jaṅghā* decorated with a single band of sculptured niches crowned by tall *udgamas* and an unpretentious plan, generally consisting of only the sanctum and *antarāla*, which in a few cases is preceded by the *ardhamaṇḍapa*.

The group of temples at Naresar, near Gwalior, forming the earliest examples of the central Indian Pratīhāra style show a square sanctum with a curvilinear *tri-ratha śikhara* of a stunted shape and a constricted *antarāla* with a simple gabled roof, forming the *śukanāsikā*. Their doorway is of the overdoor design usually with three simple *śākhās* decorated with *patralatā* (scrolls), *stambhaśākhā* (pilasters) and *nāga-śākhā* or serpents whose tails are held in the hands of Garuḍa represented on the *lalāṭa-bimba*. The door-lintel shows short *udgamas* composed of bold *chaitya*-arches, surmounted by a frieze of chain-and-bell design which continues round the shrine. The *jaṅghā* is plain except for sculptured niches on the *bhadras* depicting deities like Gaṇeśa, Kārttikeya, Lakulīśa Sūrya and Pārvatī. The large *chaitya*-window *(śūrasenaka)* on the *antarāla* roof is inset with a relief figure, usually representing Lakulīśa. The site also has an interesting rectangular shrine showing two *bhadras* on the longer rear side with the usual sculptured niches and a *śālā-śikhara* (wagon-vault roof). The group of temples at Batesara, District Morena and the

Mahādeva temple at Amrol, District Gird, are similar on plan, the latter being slightly larger and more elaborate in ornamentation. The Amrol temple has on each projection of its *jaṅghā* a sculptured niche crowned by a short but bold *udgama*, the sculptures representing the *parivāra* of Śiva including *gaṇas*. Its doorway is more ornate, its *stambha-śākhā* being embellished with graceful figures of *apsarases* and *mithunas*. These temples anticipate the Telī-kā-Mandir at Gwalior and are datable roughly to the eighth century.

The ruined Śiva temple at Mahua, District Shivapuri, is also comparable in lay-out and date with the Amrol temple but shows divergence in details of design and ornamentation. This temple replaces the *kalaśa* moulding of the *adhishṭhāna* on the *bhadra-nāsikā* by bold and ornate square rafter-ends, a feature characteristic of central India from earlier times. The *jaṅghā* shows a deeper and more prominent niche which is confined to the *bhadra*. The remaining projections of the *jaṅghā* are plain but are cantoned by *ruchaka* or square pilasters with few ornaments, comprising *ghaṭa-pallava*, *padma-bandha* and foliage brackets, typical of the Pratīhāra art. A broad recess *(pushpa-kaṇṭha)* separates the *jaṅghā* from the *śikhara* which repeats the *bhūmi-āmalakas* on the minor *nāsikās* of the central *ratha*, as seen on the roughly contemporary temple at Pashtar in Saurashtra and Temple No. IV at Barakar, District Burdwan. Its doorway is similar to that of Amrol but adds a *gandharva-śākhā* which also occurs earlier on one of the shrines at Naresar.

A small shrine at Terahi, District Shivapuri, is only slightly later in date than the foregoing with a corresponding advance on plan comprising *pañcha-ratha* sanctum with an *ardha-maṇḍapa* of one *chatushkī* in front. The *jaṅghā* shows on the *anurathas* pilasters of an early Pratīhāra order and on the *karṇas dikpāla*-figures in small niches surmounted by tall elegant *udgamas*. The *salilāntaras* are also decorated with tall thin *udgamas*. That these shrines belong to the experimental stage is indicated by the ugly and dumpy *kūṭa-chhādya* over their *bhadra*-niches and by the appearance of *bhūmi-āmalakas* also on the *anurathas* of the *śikhara* as seen on the neighbouring temple at Mahua which is hardly a mile away.

Telī-kā-Mandir at Gwalior is the grandest temple of the Pratīhāra style, but is exceptional in design and composition. It consists on plan of a rectangular sanctum and *antarāla*, the former surmounted by a lofty (93 ft. high) *śālā-śikhara* (wagon-vault roof). The *adhishṭhāna* mouldings are simple and bold, but include a recessed frieze of sculptures representing gods, goddesses and *dikpālas* in niches surmounted by rich scrolls. The *bhadra* and *antarāla* projections of the *jaṅghā* display elaborate niche-shrines surmounted by either a Nāgara *śikhara* or an elaborate *udgama*, or both. The remaining *rathas* of the *jaṅghā* also show smaller replicas of the same designs. The *śikhara* is composed of two *bhūmis* indicated by *bhūmi-āmalakas* which are crowned by a wagon-vault roof of two stages. On the shorter sides, the central *ratha* of the *śikhara* shows a progressively widening series of three *śūra-senakas* (*chaitya*-windows), surmounted by an enormous sun-window, crowned by an ornate arch. On the longer sides, however, the oblong superstructure is decorated with a monotonous design of double rows of niches. The temple is entered through a grand flight of steps leading to an elaborate doorway of five *śākhās* carved in the lower parts with the river-goddesses flanked by attendants and Śaiva *dvārapālas*, the latter indicating the Śaiva dedication of the temple. The decorative and plastic theme and style together with the palaeography of its short inscriptions suggest *circa* 850 as the date of this temple which appears to have been built by Mihira Bhoja (*circa* 836-888), the most powerful among the Pratīhāra kings.

In decorative and architectural features the ruined Śiva temple at Indor, District Guna, with a dilapidated *śikhara* bears striking affinity to the Telī-kā-Mandir with which it is not only co-eval but may even share common authorship. This temple, however, is circular on plan showing twelve *bhadras (dvādaśa-bhadra vṛitta-saṁsthānaka)*, each *bhadra* alternating with an acute-angled projection *(phālanā)*, which though plain produces an effective chiaroscuro on the *jaṅghā*. The scheme is continued on the *śikhara* where each *bhadra* is surmounted by a *ratha* showing the usual *jālaka* of *chaitya*-arches and each alternate projection by a *karṇa-ratha* showing five *bhūmi-āmalakas*. The *bhadras* are decorated on the *jaṅghā* with niches which are surmounted by tall *udgamas* and contain bold images of Gaṇeśa, Kārttikeya, Umā and the eight *dikpālas* which represent fine specimens of the Pratīhāra art.

The cognate temples of Telī-kā-Mandir at Gwalior and Śiva temple at Indor are followed by the Jarai Math at Barwasagar, District Jhansi, and Gadarmal temple at Badoh, District Vidisha. Both share a rectangular sanctum and niche-shrines on the *bhadras* with the Telī-kā-Mandir, but unlike the latter, their sanctum is *pañcha-ratha* on plan and is roofed by a partly preserved massive northern *śikhara*. Both have elaborately ornamented pillars and entrance doorway of five *śākhās*, but while the Jarai Math is an unpretentious structure comprising only a sanctum and *antarāla*, the Gadarmal adds to these a *maṇḍapa* with transepts and an *ardha-maṇḍapa*, enclosed by a high *kakshāsana*-balustrade punctuated with projecting elephant figures *(mattavāraṇa)*.

The Gadarmal temple stands on an extensive ornate platform surrounded by seven subsidiary shrines and has lavishly decorated *maṇḍapa* pillars. Being more evolved on plan and in design than the foregoing Pratīhāra temples, it is slightly later and appears to date from the ninth century.

The Chaturmukha Mahādeva temple at Nachna, District Panna, has the rare distinction of carrying over its sanctum one of the earliest specimens of the typical northern *śikhara*, which, though curvilinear and *pañcha-ratha* in design, is yet elemental in proportion. The temple preserves only a square *tri-ratha* sanctum with a plain interior and a richly decorated exterior. The interior, lighted by a doorway in the east and trellis-windows on the remaining three sides, enshrines a powerful Chaturmukha Śiva-*liṅga*, noted for the sublime expression on its four faces. Externally the trellis-windows on the *bhadra*-projections are surmounted by a pair of niches depicting *vidyādhara* couples crowned by *udgamas* (pediments of *chaitya*-arches). Each corner *ratha* of the *jaṅghā* shows a niche carrying an image of *dikpāla*, surmounted by an elaborate *udgama*. Of five storeys, the *śikhara* is completely covered with a *jālaka* (mesh) of *chaitya*-arches. All its *rathas* extend to the *grīvā* which is surmounted by a heavy *āmalaka* of which only the lower half is preserved. While the windows and doorways of the temple are carved with friezes of *gaṇas*, scrolls, river-goddesses and the over-door design in the Gupta tradition, its mouldings and *śikhara* design, the treatment of the *dikpālas* and decorative motifs like the *udgamas*, heart-shaped motif of *tamāla-patra*, garland loops and square rafter-ends carved with conventional lion-heads, are of the developed Pratīhāra type.

The small but well-proportioned Sun temple at Mankheda, District Tikamgarh, is a gem of the Pratīhāra style, roughly assignable to the same date as the above. The temple consists of a square *pañcha-ratha* sanctum with a *pañcha-ratha śikhara*, an *antarāla* with an ornate and elaborate *śukanāsa*, surmounted by a lion figure, and an *ardha-maṇḍapa* of one *chatushkī*. The well-preserved *śikhara* has excellent proportions and its central *ratha* projects beyond the *grīvā* which is surmounted by a heavy *āmalaka*.

The Kuṭakeśvara temple at Pathari, consisting of a *tri-ratha* pyramidal *śikhara* of horizontal tiers *(pīḍhās)*, a constricted *antarāla* and an *ardha-maṇḍapa* of one *chatushkī*, is as simple as the rock-cut Chaturbhuja temple at Gwalior, comprising a sanctum with a *pañcha-ratha śikhara* and a similar *antarāla* and *ardha-maṇḍapa*. Both are assignable to the ninth century, the latter being securely dated to *circa* 875 by an inscription pertaining to the reign of Mihira Bhoja.

Of the Jaina temples at Deogarh, District Jhansi, Nos. 12 and 15 are best preserved and are referable to the ninth century. Temple 15 is a triple-shrined structure with the roofs lost and the plain *jaṅghā* relieved by shallow sculptured niches surmounted by *udgamas*. The structure consists of three tiny sancta sharing a common *navaraṅga-maṇḍapa* which is entered from the *ardha-maṇḍapa* through a doorway. The four pillars and twelve pilasters of the *maṇḍapa* and the doorway bear typical Pratīhāra ornaments. Temple 15 is a *sāndhāra* structure, comprising only sanctum and *antarāla*, enclosed by an ambulatory which is covered by a sloping roof internally. Its sanctum proper is *pañcha-ratha* on plan and carries a *pañcha-ratha śikhara* of a massive proportion. Its outer decor is distinctive and shows on the *jaṅghā* latticed windows alternating with pilasters, the former inset with shallow niches surmounted by thin and tall *udgamas*. The niches contain relief figures of twenty-four labelled Jaina Yakshīs round the *jaṅghā* which shows false doorway designs on the three *bhadra*-projections.

The Mālādevī temple at Gyaraspur, District Vidisha, is a partly rock-cut *sāndhāra-prāsāda* and a mature example of the Pratīhāra style, consisting on plan of *ardha-maṇḍapa*, *maṇḍapa*, *antarāla* and sanctum with an ambulatory. Each of its shorter sides shows a pair of non-functional balconied windows of the *kakshāsana* design, while the longer sides show three such windows. The sanctum is *tri-ratha* on plan with a *pañcha-ratha śikhara* of nine *aṇḍakas* which is strikingly similar in design to that of the Śiva temple at Kerakot in Kachh. The *rathas* of the *śikhara* extend to the *grīvā* which is surmounted by a pair of *āmalakas* and *kalaśa*. The *maṇḍapa* and *ardha-maṇḍapa* roofs are pyramidal and composed of horizontal *pīḍhās* alternating with recesses. The temple interior has two ornate doorways of five *śākhās*. The *maṇḍapa* doorway shows a figure of Chakreśvarī as the *lalāṭa-bimba*, while the sanctum doorway is carved with a row of standing Jinas on the lintel. This temple shows on the facades images of Jaina Yakshīs some of which are labelled in ninth century characters. The mature decorative motifs and architectural features combined with the developed iconography would indicate a late ninth century date for this temple.

Central India is full of smaller temples of the Pratīhāra style, but most of them have lost their *śikharas*. All of them have a simple plan and display the characteristic ornaments of the style including tall *udgamas*, a frieze of garland loops on the top of the *jaṅghā*, a *nāga-śākhā* on the doorway and rich carvings of *ghaṭa-pallava*, scrolls, *kīrttimukhas* and a square ribbed cushion capital on the pillars.

PRATĪHĀRA TEMPLES OF RAJASTHAN

Rajasthan was also a prolific centre of Pratīhāra architecture. The earliest dated temple in Rajasthan is the Śītaleśvara at Chandravati, near Jhalrapatan, built in 689. Of the original temple only the *tri-ratha* sanctum and *antarāla*, devoid of roofs, have survived. The sanctum has prominent niche-shrines on the *bhadras*. The *adhishṭhāna* mouldings are bold and simple. The *jaṅghā* consists of plain wall surface, punctuated with heavy square pilasters, the latter decorated with a *ghaṭa-pallava* motif at the base and capital, a median *paṭṭa* of scrolls, a *padma-bandha* of *kīrttimukhas* and geese and brackets of plain curved profile. The sanctum doorway was originally of four ornate *śākhās* including a *ratna-śākhā*. The Gaṅgā and Yamunā are represented in the Gupta sculptural tradition on its lower part.

The Harshat-mātā temple at Abaneri, District Jaipur, is a ruined *sāndhāra* temple of which only the sanctum, shorn of its *śikhara*, has survived standing on two stepped terraces. The sanctum is *pañcha-ratha* on plan and in elevation with a sculptured niche on each *ratha* of the *jaṅghā*, The *bhadra*-niches on the *jaṅghā* of the sanctum show Vishṇu, Varuṇa(?) and Balarāma respectively on the south, west and north sides. In the sanctum is now enshrined an image of four-armed Harasiddhi, locally called Harshat-mātā. The facades of the sanctum shell and the upper terrace are decorated with niches containing religious and secular sculptures, each surmounted by a large *udgama*. The *adhishṭhāna* mouldings are bold and simple and the sculptures show a volume and grace reminiscent of the Gupta tradition. The decorative motifs illustrated by the *udgama* composed of bold *chaitya*-arches, pilasters surmounted by lotus brackets with quarter-lotus design, *lūmās* and wavy vegetal design of palmettes resembling those at Osian, indicate that this temple is assignable to the middle of the eighth century, The significant group of temples at Osian, District Jodhpur, belong to two series, one earlier, assignable to the eighth century and the other later, attributable to the tenth-eleventh centuries. The earlier series is represented by nearly a dozen and the later by half a dozen temples.

The earlier Osian temples are characterized by certain decorative and architectural peculiarities. They stand on a high *jagatī* with bold mouldings, usually surmounted by a *paṭṭikā* decorated with a wavy vegetal design. The *jagatī* is punctuated with sculptured niches, which are crowned by *udgamas* and contain images of Gaṇeśa, Kubera and other Brahmaṇical gods and goddesses. The *adhishṭhāna* mouldings are bold and simple. The temples are normally *pañcharatha* on plan and in elevation and show sculptured niches on all the five projections of the *jaṅghā*, but a few temples leave the projections flanking the *bhadra* bare. The niches are surmounted by *udgamas* and are larger on the *bhadras*; the latter display images of *parivārā-devatās*, such as Narasiṁha, Trivikrama, Varāha, Vishṇu or Harihara on the Vaishṇava temples. The *dikpālas* are invariably represented on the *karṇa-rathas* and other deities like Gaṇeśa, Sūrya, Chandra, Revanta, Brahmā and Pārvatī on the *anurathas* (flanking *rathas*). Temple 6 and the northwest temple,[1] however, show respectively ascetics and *apsarases* on the *anurathas*.

The *jaṅghā* is surmounted by a frieze of chain and bold *kapota*. Above the *kapota* occurs usually a broad recess, decorated with Kṛishṇa-līlā scenes on Temples 1 to 4 and with diapers or half diamonds on the remaining temples. The *śikhara*, covered with a bold *jālaka* (mesh) of *chaitya*-arches, is invariably *pañcha-ratha* in design and of five to seven *bhūmis*, indicated by *bhūmi-āmalakas*. The central *ratha* extends to the *grīvā* which is surmounted by *āmalaka*, *kalaśa* and *vījapūraka*. The earlier temples are, as a rule, *nirandhāra* and consist on plan of a sanctum, *raṅga-maṇḍapa* or open *maṇḍapa* and *ardha-maṇḍapa*. The outer bays of the *maṇḍapa* are provided with *kakshāsana*-balustrade punctuated with projecting elephant heads *(matta-vāraṇa)* as on the Gadarmal temple at Badoh. In many cases the *maṇḍapa* is of the *nava-raṅga* variety with occasional lateral transepts. The so-called Sun temple and the oldest temple of the Sachiya-mātā group have each a pair of tall pillars in front of the *sopāna* or the stepped entrance to the *ardha-maṇḍapa*. At least three temples are of the *pañchāyatana* type, viz., Harihara temples 1 and 2 and the so-called Sun temple, the last mentioned also showing traces of an enclosing cloister.

---

[1] D. R. Bhandarkar's numbering and nomenclature have been adopted for the temples at Osian—*Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India*, 1908-09, pp. 100-115.

The sanctum doorway is of four or five *śākhās*, one of which is decorated with an interlacing design of adoring Nāgas, whose tails are held in the hands of a Garuḍa figure, represented as the *lalāṭa-bimba*. The *antarāla* has a *chatushkī* of two pillars and two pilasters, the latter usually decorated with elegant figures of *apsarases*, sometimes surmounted by representations of Vāsudeva-Vishṇu and Balarāma-Saṅkarshaṇa, both riding on Garuḍa. The pillars of the *antarāla* and *maṇḍapa* are heavily decorated with designs of *ghaṭa-pallava*, *kīrttimukhas*, scrolls and square ribbed cushion, surmounted by either double *taraṅga* or palmette brackets. The ceilings of the *antarāla* and *maṇḍapa* are lavishly decorated, the former with an intricate design of *nāga-pāśa* entwining *vidyādharas*.

Among the earlier Osian temples, Harihara temple No.3 and the Jaina temple of Mahāvīra are of exceptional design. The former is unique among the Osian temples in that its *maṇḍapa* ceiling and roof are of a vaulted design and its *jagatī* is plain. From what has survived, its sanctum *śikhara* appears to be of an unusual form.

The Mahāvīra temple originally consisted of a sanctum enclosed by ambulatory, *antarāla*, *gūḍha-maṇḍapa* with a *trika-maṇḍapa* of three *chatushkīs* in front and an *ardha-maṇḍapa* of one *chatushkī*. According to an inscription the temple was originally built during the reign of Pratīhāra Vatsarāja (*circa* 783-792) which is borne out by the early form and design of the original members like the *adhishṭhāna*, interior pilasters *maṇḍapa* roof and latticed windows of the transepts. It is also learnt from epigraphic, evidence that a *valāṇaka* (covered stepped entrance) was added to the temple in *circa* 956 and an ornamental gateway *(toraṇa)* in 1016; these still survive, though the former is partly buried under the sand. The original sanctum is preserved up to the *jaṅghā*, while the *śikhara* clustered by three rows of *uraḥ* and *karṇa-śriṅgas*, showing *parikrama*, is a late restoration in the developed Rajasthan style.

The sculptures on the earlier Osian temples are characterized by a voluminous modelling, limited pantheon and simple iconography, exemplified by the two-armed *dikpāla* figures. On grounds of sculptural and architectural styles, exhibiting striking affinities with the early Pratīhāra temples of central India, the earlier Osian temples are assignable to the eighth century, which is corroborated by the palaeography of an inscription engraved on the Piplādevī temple.

The Kālikā-mātā temple at Chittorgarh, originally dedicated to the Sun-god, is a *sāndhāra-prāsāda* consisting of a *pañcha-ratha* sanctum with three transepts, *antarāla*, *mahā-maṇḍapa* with lateral transepts and *ardha-maṇḍapa*, all devoid of the orginal roofs. The *adhishṭhāna*-mouldings are simple and bold, the *kapota* being surmounted by a *paṭṭikā* decorated with lotus scrolls, as at Osian. The *jaṅghā* is plain except for niches crowned by tall *udgamas*. The *jaṅghā* of the sanctum proper shows Sūrya images and the *dikpālas* respectively in the niches of the *bhadras* and *karṇa-rathas*, while the *anu-rathas* are treated as pilasters carved with sculptures of minor gods like Chandra and the twin Aśvins. The transepts of the sanctum show elaborately decorated heavy tetragonal *ruchaka*, pillars carrying double-*taraṅga* brackets. The *mahā-maṇḍapa* is of the *nava-raṅga* variety with a lofty central *aṅkaṇa*. Its ceilings are normally flat and disposed in registers decorated with relief figures depicting deities, *vidyādharas*, etc. The pillars are profusely decorated and carry ornate brackets of the double-*taraṅga* variety. The sanctum doorway is of four ornamental *śākhās* with an image of Sūrya as the *lalāṭa-bimba*, the whole flanked by an elaborate figure-composition of gods and demi-gods dominated by a large relief of Sūrya.

The *lūmās* suspended from the *kapota* moulding of its *adhishṭhāna*, the ornate central pillars of the *mahā-maṇḍapa*, the profusely carved pillars with square ribbed cushions surmounted by double-*taraṅga* brackets, the projecting elephants from the pillar-bases of the *kakshāsana* and the long *udgamas* indicate that this temple is not far in date from the earlier group of Osian temples. It is significant that the *gajatālu* (coffered cusp) design appears here on the ceilings in a nascent stage. The sculptures still retain the Gupta flavour with an elegant modelling and meditative expression. The temple is, therefore, roughly assignable to the early ninth century.

The Ghaṭeśvara temple at Badoli, District Udaipur, consists of a *pañcha-ratha* sanctum with an elegantly proportioned *pañcha-ratha śikhara*, *antarāla* with a stepped and gabled roof and *maṇḍapa* with a pyramidal roof of horizontal tiers flanked by four miniature *tri-ratha śikharas*. A disproportionately large *sabhā-maṇḍapa* with a *samvaraṇā* roof was added in front of the temple nearly a century later. The *adhishṭhāna*-mouldings are bold and simple. The *jaṅghā*, divided into five projections, is plain and shows a sculptured niche only on the *bhadra*, crowned by an *udgama*. The *bhadra*-niches display images of Andhakāntaka, Naṭarāja and Chāmuṇḍā respectively on the south, west and north. The *jaṅghā* is separated from the *śikhara* by a *pushpa-kaṇṭha* between two *kapota* mouldings. The central and the flanking *rathas* of the *śikhara* project beyond the *grīvā* which is surmounted by two *āmalakas* and a *ghaṭa-pallava*. The sanctum has a circular ceiling decorated with an elaborate lotus flower with a large pendant. The sanctum doorway is of the *pañcha-śākhā* variety but plain except for relief sculptures of which most prominent is the Naṭarāja constituting the *lalāṭa-bimba*.

The *maṇḍapa* is entered through a simple but elegant *makara-toraṇa* and is an open oblong compartment, supported on four massive pillars. Two of its pillars are octagonal below, showing on the alternate facets of the octagon figures of *apsarases*, each standing on a lotus leaf. These resemble the *apsarases* from Khajuraho in posture, verve and apparel. Each pillar-capital comprises *āmalaka* and ribbed *padma* and supports a square block, relieved with figures and surmounted by double-*taraṅga* brackets. The ceiling, made of two intersectings quares, is elaborately decorated with lotuses, divine couples and *gaja-tālus* (coffered cusps) of which the central one has a pendant, terminating in a flying *vidyādhara* figure.

In the design of the *apsarases* figures and the *makara-toraṇa* and in the treatment of the pillars, ceilings and the *śikhara*, this building anticipates the Lakshmaṇa temple at Khajuraho and appears to date roughly from the end of the ninth century.

The Kumbhaśyāma temple at Chittorgarh is strikingly similar to the Kālikā-mātā temple on plan, but is later and more developed. It still shows simple and bold *adhishṭhāna*-mouldings, but the *antarapatra* is decorated with diamonds framed by pilasters. The sculptured niches of the *jaṅghā* facades carry a short pyramidal *udgama* and display images of gods and goddesses including the eight *dikpālas*. The top of the *jaṅghā* is decorated with a frieze of intersecting garland-loops. All its roofs and *kakshāsana*-balustrades are restored together with the lintels, ceilings and most of the pillars of the interior. The sanctum, however, appears to be original and shows bold *adhishṭhāna*-mouldings, carrying a *jaṅghā*, decorated with sculptured niches on the projections and the recesses, the latter crowned by tall *udgamas*. As all the *dikpālas*, except *Īśāna*, are two-armed on this temple which shows many decorative designs typical of the Pratīhāra style, it may roughly belong to the same time as the temples at Badoli.

PRATĪHĀRA ART OF RAJASTHAN

One of the most characteristic features of Indian art is the harmonious integration of sculpture with architecture. In the Gupta period sculpture has its existence apart from architecture and to a certain extent dominates over the latter. It is since the Pratīhāra age that sculpture becomes architectonic and merges with architecture. The *parivāra-devatās* are now invariably carved in the niches of the central projections (*bhadras*) which are crowned by pediments of *chaitya*-arches (*udgamas*). The *ashṭadikpālas* or the eight guardians of the quarters are regularly introduced on the corner projections of the shrine facades which are further adorned with other well-defined plastic and decorative ornaments.

This age was also remarkable for the growth of Āgama literature and Hindu mythology which are reflected in the enormous development of iconography. The concepts of the various *anugraha-* and *saṁhāra-mūrtis* of Śiva including Ardhanārīśvara, Aja Ekapāda and Liṅgodbhava forms, of Maheśamūrti and Lakulīśa, Sapta-mātṛikās, Vishṇu as Vaikuṇṭha and Viśvarūpa and Kṛishṇa-līlā scenes were elaborated during this age. The same is also true of the Buddhist pantheon and relative iconography which showed a phenomenal development.

The sculpture from the Harshat Mātā temple at Abaneri is representative of the Pratīhāra art of Rajasthan from *circa* eighth century, is essentially architectonic and has a sensitively modelled heavy body form, informed by a soft pliability which is characteristic of the later Gupta art. It still breathes an aroma of the Classical art and many of the figures reveal an aristocratic detachment and calm dignity which are classical traits. Besides gods, goddesses and Brahmanical legends, various romantic secular themes of dance, music, garden-sport and love have been depicted with a rich luxuriousness and a sense of abandon and delight. Most of the love-scenes are characterized by extraordinary delicacy and warm tenderness. The sensuousness and agitated movement are somewhat reminiscent of Vengi. Particularly remarkable is the narrative scene depicting an angry Nāga king striking a Nāgī with a sword which shows dramatic movement and vigour. Of unusual charm is an interesting musical theme representing *tāla* and *laya* in human forms. Notable among the religious subjects are scenes of Keśinisūdana, Gaja-Lakshmī flanked by Gaṇeśa and Kubera, Balarāma, Mahishāsuramardinī, Śiva-Pārvatī, Ardha-nārīśvara, Gaṇeśa and Vishṇu in various forms.

The sculptures from the recently discovered site of Santhuli, District Alwar, are roughly contemporary with those of Abaneri and share most of their characteristics. Particularly remarkable are two heads from this site which constitute excellent specimens of portraiture and characterization.

Chandravati (modern Jhalrapatan) has yielded some very interesting images showing syncretic iconographical forms. Artistically the most notable is the standing figure of Ardha-nārīśvara with an oval face, thick warm lips and half closed eyes, characterized by an expression of meditative calm and serenity.

The sculptural art of Osian is also representative of the Pratīhāra art of Rajasthan. The walls of the Osian temples pulsate with lovely sculptured forms representing a wide variety of gods and goddesses including different forms of Vishṇu, Śiva and Śakti, Sūrya, Chandra, Revanta, Gaṇeśa, Kārttikeya, the *dikpālas* and *apsarases*. Among the Vaishṇava forms most popular are Harihara, Narasiṁha and Trivikrama, the last notable for vigorous movement and dramatic intensity. The bodily type reveals a conscious strength that seems to swell the outline from within. Most of the Osian temples are decorated with a running frieze depicting Kṛishṇa's birth and his exploits and dalliances. These are characterized by unusual vigour and a sense of playful abandon and gaiety; in most cases the facial features reveal a peculiar ethnic type, probably representing the Gurjara stock.

The site of Badoli has a very expressive image of Maheśamūrti of the eighth century enshrined in one of the smaller shrines, besides charming figures of *apsarases* and images of Andhakāntaka, Naṭarāja and Chāmuṇḍā of the ninth century on the principal temple known as Ghaṭeśvara. The site has also yielded a fine frieze of Harihara-Pitāmaha where Śiva is represented as Lakulīśa and closely resembles a Buddha or Jina figure.

PRATĪHĀRA ART OF MADHYADEŚA

Kanauj has yielded some of the finest Pratīhāra sculptures of Madhyadeśa, of which notable are Vishṇu as Viśvarūpa, Śiva as Kalyāṇasundaramūrti, six-armed dancing Gaṇeśa and Chaturmukha Śiva-*liṅga*. The faces of all the Kanauj figures including gods are effeminate, though the physiognomical type is massive with a supple modelling and gliding outline of a mannered classical type. The dancing Gaṇeśa is creditable for the sense of movement, while the Chaturmukha Śiva-*liṅga* has a beatific expression revealing sensuous charm rather than serene spirituality.

The site of Naresar has also yielded a figure of Gaṇeśa similar to that of Kanauj. The physiognomical form of Naresar is more robust but the treatment is coarse. The exaggerated and almost inorganic tilt of the head of Gaṅgā and Yamunā figures on one of the door-way of temples here definitely reveals a low craftsmanship.

Compared to Naresar, Badoh and Pathari have more artistic figures, though they are largely short and massive, revealing drowsy heaviness. The same is true also of other centres of Pratīhāra art of Madhyadeśa in general and Central India in particular.

CONCLUSION

It will thus be seen that the art-critics have not been quite fair in adjudging the merits of the post-Gupta art. The art of 7th-8th centuries neither marked the desiccation of the creative genius nor did it simply feast on the remnants of the bygone Classical age. Apart from the supreme sculptural achievements of Ellora and Elephanta, these centuries were marked by abundant cultural activity in all parts of the country. The creative record of the age is illustrated by an outburst of Kaliṅga art under the Bhauma-Karas and of the early Western Indian art under the Maitrakas and by an enormous output of sculpture under the Pratīhāras throughout North and Central India including Rajasthan.

राज्य संग्रहालय पुस्तकालय, लखनऊ
क्रम 3934
प्राप्ति तिथि 26.8.70
State Museum, Library, Lko.